Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Licensing Support Network Advisory
                 Review Panel

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Wednesday, February 28, 2018

Work Order No.:   NRC-3529   Pages 1-141

1   UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2   NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3   + + + + +

4   LICENSING SUPPORT NETWORK ADVISORY REVIEW PANEL

5   + + + + +

6   MEETING

7   + + + + +

8   WEDNESDAY

9   FEBRUARY 28, 2018

10   + + + + +

11   ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

12   + + + + +

13   The Advisory Committee met at the Nuclear

14 Regulatory Commission, Three White Flint North, Room

15 01C3, 11601 Landsdown Street, Rockville, Maryland, at

16 10:03 a.m., Andy Bates, Chairman, and Chip Cameron,

17 Facilitator, presiding.

18

19 BOARD MEMBERS:

20 ANDY BATES, Chairman

21 JESSICA BIELECKI, NRC

22 LAURIE BORSKI, State of Nevada

23 ANNE COTTINGHAM, NEI*

24 ROBERT HALSTEAD, State of Nevada

25 GREGORY JAMES, Inyo County, California*

1   ABIGAIL JOHNSON, Eureka County, Nevada*

2   PHIL KLEVORICK, Clark County, Nevada*

3   L. DARRELL LACY, Nye County, Nevada*

4   SUSAN LYNCH, State of Nevada*

5   MARTIN MALSCH, State of Nevada

6   REX MASSEY, Churchill and Lander Counties, Nevada*

7   LEVI MCALLISTER, DOE

8   TIM MCCARTIN, NRC

9   ROD MCCULLUM, NEI

10   JOHN MCINTIRE, NEI

11   LOREEN PITCHFORD, Churchill and Lander Counties,

12   Nevada

13   THOMAS POINDEXTER, DOE

14   BRYAN PYLE, White Pine County, Nevada*

15   KAITLIN REKOLA, NEI

16   CARRIE SAFFORD, NRC

17   CONNIE SIMKINS, City of Caliente, Nevada, and

18   Lincoln County, Nevada*

19   JUDY TREICHEL, Nevada Nuclear Waste Taskforce, Inc.

20   HEATHER WESTRA, Prairie Island Indian Community*

21   IAN ZABARTE, Native Community Action Council*

22

23

24

25

1   ALSO PRESENT:

2   CHIP CAMERON, Facilitator

3   DENNIS BECHTEL*

4   PAUL BOLLWERK, NRC, ASLBP

5   RUSSELL CHAZELL, Office of the Secretary, NRC

6   K.G. GOLSHAN, Branch Chief, OCIO, NRC

7   MARGIE JANNEY, Acting Administrator, LSN, NRC

8   REKHA NAMBIAR, NRC

9   BRIAN NEWELL, Office of the Secretary, NRC

10   ANDY WELKIE, IT Specialist, NRC

11   THOMAS WELLOCK, NRC Historian, NRC

12

13   *Present by telephone

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1   C-O-N-T-E-N-T-S

2   <u>Page</u>

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1   P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2   (9:59 a.m.)

3   CHAIRMAN BATES: Good morning ladies and

4   gentlemen, welcome back to the 2nd Day of the LSNARP

5   meeting. I think we've got everybody now at the table

6   that was here yesterday, other than Diane Curran. I

7   understand she's probably not going to join us today.

8   But also on line we have Abby Johnson from

9   Eureka County. We have Loreen Pitchford for Lander

10   and Churchill County, Rex Massey at Churchill County,

11   Darrell Lacy, Nye County, and Susan Lynch also from

12   the State of Nevada is on our GoToMeeting connection.

13   With that I'd like to go to Chip to kind

14   of do a recap from yesterday and then we'll move on to

15   some discussion of our Option 3 and Option 4 in the

16   paper that we've put together.

17   MR. KLEVORICK: Chip, Phil Klevorick is on

18   the line as well.

19   CHAIRMAN BATES: Okay, thank you.

20   MR. KLEVORICK: You're welcome.

21   MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Andy.

22   I just wanted to do a brief recap of yesterday, and I

23   thought that you all had a good discussion. And you

24   all being people in the room, ARP members on through

25   GoToMeeting.

1   But, I just wrote down some themes that we

2   had during the whole day. Resources, resources,

3   resources. Okay, the need for further, the need for

4   funding for further participation.

5   And note that in the corral we're going to

6   have a discussion of timing and resource needs. And

7   Ian Zabarte brought this need for funding up in the

8   context of tribal nations, tribal organizations.

9   Phil Klevorick talked about the AULGs.

10   Bob Halstead talked about Nevada counties. And this

11   is not only a dollar's issue, necessarily for a

12   discussion of this, but there's other facets of this.

13   For example, Bob Halstead also mentioned

14   tribal nations yesterday and he said, they're going to

15   need to determine what they need to participate.

16   While, maybe there is things like that that can happen

17   without funding.

18   And we do have representatives from the

19   Department of Energy here. We have Tom Poindexter and

20   Levi McAllister.

21   And, Tom, at any point if you want to say

22   anything about the funding issue, if you want to, you

23   go right ahead, okay. Just raise your name tag. Do

24   you want to do it now?

25   MR. POINDEXTER: Yes, I'll just comment on

1 it now because it's going to be the same response. We

2 also don't have funding. So, until we receive funding

3 and any understand and limitations on that funding, or

4 allowances on that funding, we really can't offer any

5 comment.

6 We hear you, we understand. And before

7 some funding had been provided and certain

8 circumstances, but we also are in a wait and see mode.

9 But we do hear you. We're listening very carefully.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,

11 Tom.

12 A theme that's related to the resource

13 issue is people feel this is only a preliminary, this

14 meeting. This is only a preliminary discussion, we

15 should not be defending any option at this point.

16 It's still useful for us to hear what you

17 think about the various options, and we'll have a

18 discussion of that later this afternoon. Judy

19 Treichel talked about when we have a technical working

20 group.

21 And of course, if you're going to have a

22 technical working group, there's going to have to be

23 resources to fund participation in that technical

24 working group. So there's a connection there.

25 Two themes. A third theme, discussion of

1   what should be a reconstituted or replaced LSN, should

2   begin with what Bob Halstead called functional

3   requirements.

4   And he named a bunch of what I was calling

5   attributes. He called them functional requirements,

6   fairness, transparency, acceptable, fast, accurate,

7   comprehensive and cost effective.

8   We heard other statements about cost

9   should not be a driving issue. We also heard that the

10   cost of funding, the LSN, is a very small cost

11   compared to the total high-level waste life cycle. In

12   terms of the fairness option that was amplified, in

13   terms of small players, the general public.

14   And speaking of the public, that was

15   another theme that needs to be useful to the public.

16   Public ease of access. We heard many statements about

17   comparisons to Google, okay.

18   So, those are the themes that I got from

19   going back over the flip charts from yesterday. We

20   also had some clarifications on the options.

21   For example, on Option 1, that it's for

22   new documents. And if there is going to be, there

23   could be public access to those new documents.

24   For example, the NRC documents are going

25   to be in ADAMS. Other parties could make their

1 documents available.

2   And that the LSN ADAMS system, we talked

3 about that being the foundation for Option 2. But

4 it's also relevant to Option 1 and perhaps Option 3.

5   And I think the catalyst, the Option 2

6 discussion, and stimulated by Laurie's work on this

7 and by the NRC ADAMS staff, or LSN staff, that was a

8 catalyst for a discussion of what would have to be

9 done to make Option 2 a useful litigation support

10 system.

11   We had the famous Page 10 replacing all

12 documents sentence and so we have that cleared up.

13   But any rate, those are some themes and

14 some things I heard yesterday. And Bob Halstead is

15 demonstrating that if you want to talk, put your name

16 tent up. And Rod McCullum. The name tent people.

17   Rod, do you want to go first before we go

18 to --

19   MR. MCCULLUM: Yes, I did --

20   MR. CAMERON: Okay.

21   MR. MCCULLUM: This is a clarification on

22 the functional requirements or attributes. Our chief

23 information officer over here reminded me that we

24 forgot one. And it's a very important one. And that

25 would be secure.

1   In that the whole science of cybersecurity

2   did not exist when we created the original LSN, and

3   now it's a very big deal. And I think the reason I am

4   raising my tent at this point in the meeting is that,

5   as we go through the remaining options, I think that

6   where we start to talk about creating new stuff, I

7   think that topic of cybersecurity needs to be part of

8   that discussion.

9   MR. CAMERON: Oh. Okay, cybersecurity.

10   MR. MCCULLUM: Yes. That's just another

11   functional requirement, along with fair and fast.

12   MR. CAMERON: Oh, good.

13   MR. MCCULLUM: Yes.

14   MR. CAMERON: Good, good, good.

15   MR. MCCULLUM: Yes. I would call it

16   secure or cybersecure.

17   MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. And, Bob,

18   is that the same point you had?

19   MR. HALSTEAD: No, I have a couple others,

20   Chip. Although I certainly agree with that one.

21   MR. CAMERON: Okay.

22   MR. HALSTEAD: First of all, when you were

23   talking about the discussion we had about the time and

24   money issues, I think it is important to acknowledge

25   the point that Rod made that it's not just a matter of

1 the money for going forward with a particular option,

2 but the lead times. And from certainly the

3 information I'm aware of, both the dollar and lead

4 time requirements that are summarized in Appendix D,

5 I think those seem reasonable to us.

6 But, it isn't just a matter of the money.

7 So, in terms of resumption, you have to really pay

8 attention to that lead time issue.

9 And secondly, on the money itself, we said

10 yesterday, if you look at a five year licensing

11 proceeding and the cost of reconstituting the LSN and

12 the operating it for, certainly intensely during that

13 five year period, the cost discriminators are not

14 great, so your low end is like in the $8 to $10

15 million cost and your high-end is in somewhere like

16 the $12 to $16 million cost.

17 And the significance of those relatively

18 small dollar costs is not in comparison to the

19 lifecycle cost of the repository, which is $80 to $100

20 billion. But it's a small number in comparison to the

21 cost for the licensing proceeding.

22 So there's even less of a rationale then

23 you would otherwise find, I think, to let cost be the

24 driver of the decision here for this tool that's going

25 to be most important. If there is a resumption of the

1   adjudication over about five years.

2   And finally, I know we're going to talk

3   about this a lot today, but it did come into the

4   discussion at the end of the day yesterday. And that

5   is, that in terms of evaluating all of the options, we

6   probably might have started first.

7   And maybe this occurred to you after you

8   had done the options paper, with the discussion that's

9   on Page 42, about the federal governments Cloud first

10 policy. And the way that that really does, frankly

11 almost moot further discussion of 1, 2 and 4 if you

12 take seriously that shall of practical language.

13   So, anyway, those are just things that I

14 thought we'd reiterate. And I think you did a good

15 job capturing yesterday's meeting overall.

16   MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,

17 Bob. And we do have that federal government policy --

18   MR. HALSTEAD: Yes.

19   MR. CAMERON: -- in the corral.   And

20 Margie also is going to talk about that, but go ahead,

21 Margie, say what you need to say.

22   MS. JANNEY: So, one that we, I feel like

23 we didn't read the whole sentence yesterday. Because

24 the Cloud 1st policy is only about new investments.

25   So, Option 2 would not be a new

1 investment, that is adding more money to, or making

2 changes to a current investment. So the Cloud 1st is

3 not applicable to that, it's only for new investments

4 or for new mission or support applications or

5 consolidating existing applications.

6 MR. HALSTEAD: I think you'll get push

7 back on that interpretation. I appreciate that. And

8 as we said, its shall, it's practical and also related

9 to new -- but, you know, when something has been dead

10 since 2011 and you bring it back, defining it as a

11 continuation rather than anew, that's always an

12 interesting appropriations discussion and an OMB

13 discussion.

14 MS. JANNEY: It was dead, so if we redid

15 the LSN, as opposed to using what is currently

16 available, which is the ADAMS LSN library, that's just

17 adding, that's a current application.

18 MR. CAMERON: And this is going to pop up

19 in Option 3, and I know that K.G. wants to say

20 something and I know Andy will want to say something

21 about the Cloud policy, but why don't we just hold

22 that, those comments for a few minutes. We're going

23 to jump into Option 3.

24 But the people who are on through

25 GoToMeeting, could you, or anybody on audio phone

1   line, could you mute their audio right now, because

2   that will be helpful for us if you could mute your

3   audio.

4   And in fact, let me just ask if there is

5   anybody on through GoToMeeting that has any comments

6   about our recap this morning?

7   MR. KLEVORICK: Chip, this is Phil

8   Klevorick.

9   MR. CAMERON: Hi, Phil.

10   MR. KLEVORICK: Yes, good morning to you

11   guys.   It's just a quick response to the DOE

12   representative who said that they weren't, they work

13   from out of nowhere of the funding and everything else

14   and that kind of stuff.

15   The difference is how it was, that they

16   still have a ton of carryover money. And so they

17   would be able to reconstitute whatever they needed to

18   do in a much faster pace. So I just want to make sure

19   that that is not lost in that whole discussion.

20   MR. CAMERON: Okay. Okay, thanks, Phil.

21   Carryover, DOE carryover money. Anybody else on

22   through GoToMeeting? That wants to say something.

23   No. Okay.

24   Well, let's jump into Option 3. Margie is

25   going to do that presentation.

1   MR. GOLSHAN: No.

2   MR. CAMERON: Oh, K.G. is going to do it.

3 Okay.

4   MR. GOLSHAN: Unless you want --

5   MR. CAMERON: Sorry, K.G.

6   (Laughter)

7   MR. CAMERON: And then we're going to go

8 back to the, we'll have a discussion, as much as you

9 want, about the Cloud policy. Federal government

10 Cloud policy.

11   MR. GOLSHAN: Good morning. Before I

12 start the Option 3 I just wanted to kind of bring to

13 everyone's attention. As we speak, there is an

14 initiative going on within the NRC that we're moving

15 everything, we're trying to move everything to the

16 Cloud.

17   So, if everything is moved to the Cloud,

18 this Option 2 also automatically goes to the Cloud.

19 And so as part of that, we've already moved our email

20 system in the Cloud.

21   Gary Young in here, he is responsible to

22 move our public website to the Cloud, hopefully by the

23 end of this year. So there is, there's all these

24 things are going on as we speak.

25   But let's talk about Option 3, which is to

1 create a replacement license support network using

2 Cloud computing. And just bring to everybody's

3 attention, so we're at the same level as far as

4 understanding, what the Cloud computing is.

5   It's basically a remote computing facility

6 accessible via internet. And it provides

7 infrastructure platform and/or software as a service.

8   They charge using a usage based pricing

9 structure, mainly, although there are other pricing

10 structures there.

11   One of the main advantages of Cloud

12 computing is, the big one, the responsibility of

13 operation and the maintenance of the Cloud

14 infrastructure, platform and software remains with the

15 current provider. Also, they provide agility.

16   And of course, everybody benefits from the

17 economy of scale. Which I say may, and I have to be

18 very careful about it because there are models that

19 I've seen that actually cost more, but they may

20 translate into a long-term cost saving.

21   We are going to be presenting two

22 alternatives for moving the LSN to the Cloud, that

23 we'll examine in the next slides. Is this working?

24 Okay.

25   Now, before we start, two assumptions.

1 Okay, the first assumption is that the LSN library, as

2 we know it, will be decommissioned. And then the

3 contents, somehow, will be transitioned over to the

4 Cloud.

5   However, the responsibility of record

6 keeping for the existing documents that are already in

7 the library will remain with NRC. Because we'll

8 already have it under disposition of retention

9 control.

10   And the second one, which touches on Mr.

11 Halstead and Rod's point, is that any Cloud provider,

12 this is the new requirement, especially in the last

13 couple of years, must follow the guidelines set by

14 federal risk and authorization management program.

15 And they must be FEDRamp certified. There is no ifs

16 and buts about it.

17   The FEDRamp certification alone limits

18 your choices in the Cloud that you have substantially.

19 And not a lot of facilities are FEDRamp, but not only

20 that, having platforms that are authorized to run

21 there.

22   And any platform you go to, and not only

23 it has to be authorized by NRC, have an ATO by NRC,

24 but also since it will impact the infrastructure of

25 the Cloud provider, it has to be approved by them to

1 operate too. Because if there is an intrusion, other

2 customers in the Cloud could maybe impact it. So that

3 is a very important factor there.

4 Option 2 provides two alternatives. One

5 alternative is that NRC will arrange and NRC will

6 manage a repository and a search portal in the Cloud.

7 In other words, we are the ones that are dealing with

8 Cloud provider and we will arrange for that. Of

9 course, collectively we all decide which portal we go

10 to.

11 And then Alternative 2 is, the

12 participants will maintain their collections in the

13 Cloud. And one of the implementations that

14 participants will have their own search interfaces.

15 Search portal.

16 So, let's talk about these alternatives

17 and implementations. These alternatives and

18 implementations. I think you should change that for

19 me. Thank you.

20 All right, the key differences are, the

21 Alternative 1, NRC will arrange a hosting of a single

22 repository of the LSN collections with a dedicated

23 search engine and advance search features using Cloud

24 resources.

25 Now, extent of advance features depends on

1   the Cloud products that are available. Every product,

2   I mentioned that to my friends yesterday here in

3   casual conversation, every product that you go to you

4   will gain something and you lose something.

5   So, I don't think in this world of IT

6   these days there is such thing as a perfect. So,

7   we'll try to get a feature rich platform.

8   Using this alternative, NRC will remain

9   the custodian of all the current and the new header

10   and documents. Submissions of the new documents, or

11   requests for modifications of documents, will be

12   exactly the same way as we described for Option 2

13   yesterday.

14   Either using EIE, if the number of actions

15   are more than a thousand, average more than a thousand

16   per month or using the semi-manual.

17   Now, Alternative 2 uses the Cloud storage

18   to host participant's document collections. However,

19   like the original LSN, each party will be responsible

20   for creating and maintaining their own collection.

21   And notifying the LSNA when updates have occurred.

22   Alternative 2 has two forms of

23   implementation. The first form is that NRC will

24   arrange hosting of a search engine as well as a

25   portal.

1   However, documents are indexed using the

2   participants collections in the Cloud. This is in

3   arraignment similar to the original LSN.

4   And then the second implementation is that

5   the search interface and the collection would be

6   provided by each party.

7   And in this case, you could only search

8   each party's collection at a time. There is not a

9   consolidated database for all the collections be

10   available for search. And NRC would simply provide a

11   web page with links to each participant's user

12   interface.

13   Next page please. Time and cost for the

14   Alternative 1, again, the cost and time is only the

15   estimates here, pertains to NRC and not the

16   participants. So these are for basically contracting

17   action, finding the portals and technical solution

18   design, development, implementation, testing.

19   And for Alternative 1, the cost ranking

20   and the time ranking relative to the other options,

21   and alternatives, is fine for both costs and time.

22   For Alternative 2(a), the first

23   implementation, the cost and time ranking is five and

24   six respectively.

25   And for the, the next page please, the

1   next one, which is for NRC, is the easiest

2   implementation. As you can see, it's reflected in the

3   cost and time ranking, which is 2.

4   And then unfortunately it is the cost to

5   the participants is undetermined by us. And it varies

6   based on the size of their collections and everything

7   else. So we have not been able to come up with any

8   estimation for that.

9   Implementation risk factors for the risk

10   factors, just to refresh everybody's memories is that,

11   the risk factors are listed in the blue bar.

12   Acquisition, technical complexity, obsolescence,

13   technical obsolescence, IT policy, technical expertise

14   and standardization.

15   These are well explained in how these

16   scores have been derived. The range is six to 54, six

17   being the lowest risk and 54 the highest risk. I

18   don't want to bore you with the calculation but --

19   And pros and cons common to all

20   alternatives. The pros are the leverage of the

21   efficiencies and scalability of the Cloud. It takes

22   advantage of existing search and other Cloud resources

23   and allows for prompt processing of large volumes of

24   documents.

25   And the cons are, close coordination with

1   all parties may be very time consuming.

2   Unique   pros   for   Alternative   1.

3   Alternative 1 continues with the standardization of

4   the LSN numbering scheme locates the documentary

5   material all in a single repository and affords that

6   the capability of audit generating logs and posting it

7   to   the   LSN   homepage   still   remains   with   this

8   alternative.

9   Cons is the complexity of implementation.

10   That initial transitioning everything to the Cloud is,

11   could be very complex. And also coordinating with

12   every participants, because there has got to be a

13   level of a standardization that may be required there.

14   A cost of developing is centralized Cloud-

15   based search portal. Additional costs associated with

16   federal record keeping.

17   And then rudimentary search capabilities,

18   depending on the Cloud offering. And document header

19   information may not be viewable.   That's highly

20   dependent on the product that is chosen.

21   Right now, within the portal that we have

22   right now, you could see the document properties. Or

23   the bibliographical information.

24   Parties   are   required   to   keep   their

25   collection up to date in the Cloud.

1   And for Alternative 2(b), oh, excuse me,

2   2(a), it mimics, the advantages mimics the original

3   LSN concept and antennas as a decentralize, and of

4   course the cost is shared by all the parties,

5   continues the standardization of the LSN accession

6   numbering scheme.

7   No NRC record responsibility for the new

8   documents and headers. And possibly a simpler process

9   for participants to make changes or introduce new

10   documents to their collections.

11   And   that   causes   a   complexity   and

12   uncertainty of implementation. Possibly a rudimentary

13   search, search and capabilities have been highly

14   dependent on the Cloud product that we go to. And

15   document header information may not be viewable. And

16   no automated audit capabilities.

17   And the unique pros for the Alternative

18   2(b). Pros are simplified approach to maintenance of

19   the headers and document collections.

20   No NRC records, responsibility of new

21   headers documents. Simpler process for participants

22   to make additions and modifications.

23   And the cons, no consolidated search and

24   capability, document header and information made not

25   viewable   based   on   the   products   chosen.   No

1 standardization of LSN accession numbering scheme, no

2 automated audit capabilities for the entire

3 collection.

4 And this slide is the overall ranking of

5 these alternatives within this option, as compared to

6 the others. You can see 20, 22 and 13. And I will

7 defer to, Chip, to start any conversation on this.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you very much,

9 K.G.

10 MR. GOLSHAN: Thank you.

11 MR. CAMERON: So, we're on Option 3 and

12 there is two alternatives to Option 3. And we already

13 had some discussion of the federal government policy,

14 Cloud policy. And that's on Page 42 of the options

15 paper.

16 And Margie talked a little bit about, it

17 only applies to new investment. And Bob Halstead put

18 a further note on, what the meaning of the term new

19 is.

20 And I know that Rod wants to say something

21 on this. We're going to go to those of you at the

22 table, first, to give us --

23 MR. KLEVORICK: Can you hear?

24 MR. CAMERON: Yes, Phil, we'll be going on

25 to you in a minute.

1   MR. KLEVORICK: I got no sound.

2   MR. CAMERON: You have no sound. Can we

3 get Phil sound?

4   (Off microphone comment)

5   MR. KLEVORICK: You can hear me, we've got

6 no sound.

7   MR. CAMERON: So you can't hear me at all?

8 Okay.

9   MR. KLEVORICK: At least on the phone.

10 I'm going to hang-up and try to call back.

11   MR. CAMERON: Oh.

12   MR. KLEVORICK: Bye.

13   MR. CAMERON: Give us a minute too to see

14 if we can fix it. Lisa, can see if any of the others

15 that are on through GoToMeeting are in the same

16 quandary that Phil is?

17   MR. LACY: This is Darrell Lacy, we're

18 fine.

19   MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks, Darrell. So,

20 it's only Phil.

21   PARTICIPANT: Because I'm fine.

22   PARTICIPANT: I am the same.

23   MR. CAMERON: Okay. Okay, well, let's see

24 if he's going to call back in and we'll see if that

25 works.

1   But to continue on with just process, get

2   some initial comments from the table. Phil, can you

3   hear now?

4   MR. KLEVORICK: I am back, can you hear

5   me?

6   MR. CAMERON: Yes, we can hear you. You

7   can hear me, right?

8   MR. KLEVORICK: Obviously, yes. Thank

9   you.

10   MR. CAMERON: Okay, good. And we're all

11   good.

12   MR. KLEVORICK: Yes, I'm not sure what

13   happened.

14   MR. CAMERON: Don't worry. I was just

15   explaining, Phil, that we're going to go to the table

16   for initial ideas first then we're going to go to all

17   of you on through GoToMeeting.

18   We're going to come back to the table and

19   GoToMeeting and have a discussion, further discussion

20   of Option 3.

21   And then we're going to hear from the

22   public. See if anybody from the public whose on

23   through GoToWebinar, through the phone, has any

24   comments. So, let's go to Rod.

25   MR. MCCULLUM: Oh, Bob had his tent up

1 first.

2   MR. CAMERON: Well, you go ahead and then

3 --

4   MR. MCCULLUM: Oh, okay.

5   MR. CAMERON: -- we'll go to Bob.

6   MR. MCCULLUM: Happy to.

7   (Off microphone comment)

8   MR. MCCULLUM: Okay, yes, right. First

9 thing is a question.

10   Does NRC have any experience with any

11 other litigation, adjudication based document, I mean,

12 you have experience with the current EIE, but do you

13 have any experience with doing this sort of thing or

14 are you aware of any experience in the Cloud base

15 manner that's been outlined here?

16   MR. GOLSHAN: Can I answer that, yes? We

17 have some experience.

18   Again, right now we're in the midst of

19 transitioning our public website to the Cloud so we're

20 going through the steps required to examine. And

21 based on the viability of the platforms and also the

22 security requirements and our requirements to be met

23 and the cost of it.

24   So, some experience we do. And also, NRC

25 is in the midst of bringing resources that are more

1 experienced in transitioning platforms to the Cloud.

2 You know, this whole initiative has

3 started, which is kind of mandated by the federal, you

4 know, by the administration and OMB.

5 So, yes, we're getting there as far as

6 bringing the right in there to help us to get there.

7 But from our initial experience, although

8 in the long run we're going to be benefitting from it,

9 we have found out getting there, it is not easy. It's

10 not kind of a forklift kind of a notion that you could

11 just forklift it and move it to the Cloud.

12 Especially these days everything is, you

13 have so many other components that are tightly kind of

14 integrated, components that are tightly integrated

15 with one another. It's not an easy proposition but

16 it's a doable thing and we're bringing the knowledge

17 in to help us do that.

18 MR. MCCULLUM: So I take its your

19 position, because in all three of these there is

20 obviously some handshakes between something NRC has in

21 the Cloud and something the participants have in the

22 Cloud.

23 MR. GOLSHAN: Right.

24 MR. MCCULLUM: So, you're just beginning

25 to address whatever cybersecurity issues might be

1   involved.

2   MR. GOLSHAN: Right. Well, as far as the

3   cybersecurity is just kind of a, in my opinion, with

4   this whole FEDRamp requirement, has made our life

5   easier because we know what the expectation is and

6   what the Cloud provider has to provide and meet our

7   expectation. So, that is all well-defined.

8   So, again, that FEDRamp usually covers the

9   infrastructure, and in some cases, the platform. But

10   the software, again, has to be accepted by the Cloud

11   provider and also has to be going through the whole

12   ATO, we call it, that authorization to operate, by

13   NRC. So there is work to do there. Involved there,

14   but you know.

15   MR. MCCULLUM: Right.

16   MR. GOLSHAN: So we are pretty experienced

17   in that regard, so there's no matter what we do we

18   have obtain that ATO.

19   MR. MCCULLUM: Okay. I have another line

20   of questions, Bob, did you want to turn and come back

21   to me or --

22   MR. HALSTEAD: Actually, I have one here

23   that's related to this.

24   MR. MCCULLUM: Okay.

25   MR. HALSTEAD: In your Slide 142, where

1 you have the implementation risk factor scores. I'm

2 sorry, in Slide 142 you have a comparison of the

3 implementation risk factor scores.

4   MR. GOLSHAN: Right.

5   MR. HALSTEAD: And maybe I missed this and

6 it's in here and I just wasn't looking for it before

7 we started talking about cybersecurity, but is there

8 any place where you break out and have a score

9 evaluation for the different alternatives,

10 specifically on the issue of cybersecurity, so I can

11 break that issue out and see how the different, I

12 guess the format would be, like in Slide 142.

13   MR. GOLSHAN: Right.

14   MR. HALSTEAD: And I just didn't know if

15 there is, I don't know, maybe you presented it and I

16 missed it here, but --

17   MR. GOLSHAN: No.

18   MR. HALSTEAD: -- useful to see as we're

19 talking about cybersecurity.

20   MR. GOLSHAN: Right. So, I think that all

21 was combined in IT policies as one risk factor and

22 that the factor was measured under the IT policy. I

23 don't think collectively we separated the security as

24 a risk factor itself. By itself.

25   Again, for Cloud specifically, and also

1 for internal systems, the risk associated with

2 cybersecurity is known. I mean, it's well-defined as

3 the steps that have to be taken and the process that

4 we have to follow, to obtain that authorization to

5 operate.

6   MR. HALSTEAD: Well, that confirms my

7 thinking that you probably just assumed cybersecurity

8 was not a discriminator. And I'm not sure there's a

9 basis for making that assumption.

10   I think before we go forward in some next

11 phase we'd want to specifically identify, just as

12 you've done here, a comparative cybersecurity risk

13 score.

14   Again, I realized you've not had a lot of

15 resources or time to do this but I think that's one of

16 the things we identify here. Assuming that,

17 particularly if it's vendors, that the vendors will

18 take care of the security. It may or may not be a

19 good assumption.

20   MR. GOLSHAN: Right.

21   MR. HALSTEAD: When we're all going to be

22 so reliant on this. That's issue Number 1. And then

23 I'll let Rod go. I have a little quirky cost question

24 but I'll let Rod go.

25   MR. MCCULLUM: Well, I have a cost

1   question that I don't think is quirky and I think it

2   impacts all of us around the table here. K.G., you

3   were very clear in that the cost numbers on here do

4   not include participant costs, these are just the

5   costs to NRC.

6   The first part of this is a question. So,

7   if you haven't included participant costs, I'm

8   assuming that your timeline estimates also don't have

9   any feedback from whether the participants would be

10   able to meet these timelines.

11   MR. GOLSHAN: You're absolutely correct.

12   We had, these are best guesstimates that we could have

13   come up with collectively that we've included there.

14   Again, those numbers are estimates, could be lower or

15   higher when the options are chosen.

16   MR. MCCULLUM: Right. And just in our

17   view, and NEI is in a similar boat to DOE, we don't

18   have money but we believe this process is important

19   and our member companies believe it's important so we

20   have the limited resources, for example, for us to be

21   here today.

22   But in our assessment, those, in this

23   area, those participant costs could be fairly

24   significant. And I think if we had to bear the cost

25   maybe we met the timelines. But I'm not sure that

 1   would be the case for some of the even smaller

 2   participants.

 3   But I think what I would propose is that

 4   this evaluation is not complete unless both the NRC

 5   costs, and the participant costs and timelines, are

 6   reflected here.

 7   MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks. Thanks, Rod.

 8   And that's a very good point.

 9   MR. HALSTEAD: And that relates to my

10   question.

11   MR. CAMERON: And I want to, we're going

12   to go to Bob.

13   MR. HALSTEAD: Okay.

14   MR. CAMERON: And then I want to hear from

15   Laurie and Jessica. And I'll only say one thing in

16   relationship to Rod's comment, is that you also need

17   to ask whether participant costs have been considered

18   in any of the other options too. Okay?

19   MR. MCCULLUM: That's what I meant when I

20   said that the whole table needs to reflect that.

21   MR. CAMERON: Okay.

22   MR. MCCULLUM: Yes.

23   MR. CAMERON: Good point. And, Bob.

24   MR. HALSTEAD: Okay, I agree on that. And

25   then there is another aspect of that. And that is

1   going back to K.G.'s first slide on system

2   assumptions.

3   Had the assumption is, the NRC is going to

4   decommission the public ADAMS LSN library. And that

5   surprised me because I would assume that once

6   documents are put into ADAMS, whether it's the public

7   LSN or in ADAMS itself, that the cost of maintaining

8   them is not very significant.

9   Now, maybe I'm wrong about that but, so

10   that's the first part of the question, and that

11   relates to Slide 141 and 140. Where we have a

12   breakout item on the NRC staff collection as

13   participant cost.

14   And it just seemed peculiar to me that an

15   annual recurring cost would be so large relative to

16   the initial costs where I assume you're just moving

17   documents you already manage.

18   So, I guess the first question is, if we

19   were going to a Cloud-based system, and I don't know

20   whether ADAMS is now going to become a Cloud-based

21   system, because from what you said, maybe that is

22   there. But having that crutch of LSN documents in the

23   ADAMS, as they are now, is a pretty security blanket

24   it would seem to me.

25   MR. GOLSHAN: Yes. So, one part of your

1 question we have to get back to you because I got to

2 go back to the group. This is about the Slide 140.

3   To look back at the original documents

4 that substantiated these numbers. And we'll get back

5 to you on that one.

6   But then going back to your first question

7 about the assumptions, again, both assumptions, now

8 whether we will arrange for a manage account option or

9 the participants would, the public repository and the

10 public portal, as we know it, is going to be

11 decommissioned. Unless we get the same platform or

12 move it to the Cloud.

13   Then the only thing in that case is where

14 the platform physically runs changes. Everything else

15 will remain the same, right? So, that is what is

16 meant by that statement.

17   MR. HALSTEAD: And is ADAMS itself, in

18 your opinion --

19   MR. GOLSHAN: No.

20   MR. HALSTEAD: -- destined to become

21 Cloud-based with this --

22   MR. GOLSHAN: So ADAMS --

23   MR. HALSTEAD: -- policy you told us

24 about?

25   MR. GOLSHAN: You know, the prefixing

1 everything with ADAMS is, and I know it's confusing

2 and I actually tried to bring this to the attention of

3 my colleagues here, the reason ADAMS is mentioned in

4 here because the security boundary is called ADAMS.

5 For example, Judy and Laurie are

6 experienced. EHG falls within ADAMS, WBA, web based

7 app, falls within ADAMS. These are completely

8 different engines, different platforms.

9 We have publishing, which is the middle,

10 in the middle, that falls within ADAMS. So, the

11 search engine for the WBA, and then the portal that we

12 use for LSN, are completely manufactured by two

13 separate manufacturers but they fall within ADAMS, the

14 boundary. So that's why the ADAMS is there.

15 So, ADAMS is made of multiple, many

16 components. Some of them will remain. So the parts,

17 the enterprise record manager which manages the

18 disposition of retentions of the existing LSN doc,

19 those will remain with us with the option one.

20 And actually, with all the options and all

21 the alternatives for the existing documents, those are

22 still the responsibility of ours. So that is not

23 going to get decommissioned.

24 MR. HALSTEAD: Okay.

25 MR. GOLSHAN: Only the public --

1   MR. HALSTEAD: Yes, I'm with you.

2   MR. GOLSHAN: All right.

3   MR. HALSTEAD: I'm with you.

4   MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks.

5   MR. HALSTEAD: It makes perfect sense but

6   it didn't make sense to me when you talked about it

7   before.

8   MR. GOLSHAN: Yes.

9   MR. CAMERON: Can we go to Laurie --

10   MR. HALSTEAD: Thank you. No, I'm done.

11   MR. CAMERON: Were you done? Thanks, Bob.

12   Let's go to Laurie and then we'll go over to Jessica.

13   Laurie.

14   MS. BORSKI: Thank you. I just have a

15   couple of questions.

16   First of all, I'm having trouble figuring

17   out the difference between this internal ADAMS LSN

18   library and the public ADAMS LSN library. My vision

19   is that the public is what we use, the public, and the

20   internal is basically a copy of the LSN that's on a

21   server, for records keeping purposes only and that no

22   one ever accesses it for searches and things like

23   that, is that right?

24   MR. GOLSHAN: No, let me explain to you.

25   So, when the -- initially we, commission ordered that

1 we make the LSN collections. Which SECY had them on

2 drives and devices and all of that.

3 We took all of those documents and created

4 an object store. And the staff required a lot more

5 advanced searching capability to go through these

6 documents to create the SER and then the EIS.

7 So, we brought Watson and we created a

8 search portal for the staff to do that. Now, and as

9 I said, it's 3.7 million documents.

10 So then when, later on commission ordered

11 to make these documents public we all said that, hey,

12 we have to at least make the same thing, that it was

13 available to the staff to the, you know, for public.

14 So therefore, we used the same platform to do it.

15 Now, the public ADAMS runs on an engine as

16 a Lucene based search engine. It's a much, much

17 smaller repository. It's 500,000 documents versus 3.7

18 million documents in LSN.

19 It has a metadata structure that are

20 completely different but they are still called ADAMS

21 because they're part of the ADAMS security phase. So

22 there is no, literately a similarity between the two.

23 A plus, the publicly available documents,

24 we have a process, we call it pass. So we get all

25 that metadata, which is that you see in the public

1 || ADAMS, the NWPA, and we stick it inside the document

2 || structure of it and then we publish it.

3 || And Google spiders that. So if you go to

4 || Google, although you cannot see the metadata and

5 || search on the metadata, like an author affiliation, it

6 || will still find the document on Google. But you will

7 || not be able to do these kind of sophisticated searches

8 || of Google, as you know. But yes, it finds it and

9 || finds it very fast.

10 || So there are differences there. They're

11 || not, the only thing that are common between them is

12 || that word ADAMS. It's unfortunately. And I know that

13 || that's, easily could create confusion.

14 || MR. CAMERON: Okay. Laurie, do you, does

15 || that answer your question?

16 || And let me just ask Margie. Can you throw

17 || some further light on this or do you want to raise

18 || another issue?

19 || MS. JANNEY: Maybe a very simple answer to

20 || your question is, we publish everything internally

21 || first and then the publicly available documents in

22 || ADAMS we publish outside.

23 || MS. BORSKI: Okay.

24 || MS. JANNEY: But all of LSN is publicly

25 || available. So everything that's internal is also

1 || available externally.

2 || So, it's kind of backwards what you were

3 || saying that everybody uses the public available LSN,

4 || and we don't do anything with the internal one, isn't

5 || really true. Because we do have our internal.

6 || If we were adding documents we would add

7 || them to the internal and then push them outside.

8 || MS. BORSKI: Okay.

9 || MS. JANNEY: So the internal is the NRC

10 || owned.

11 || MS. BORSKI: So to clarify, let's say

12 || Jessica is looking for a document for use at a

13 || hearing, I'm looking for a document to use at a

14 || hearing, she is going to use the internal system, I'm

15 || going to use the public system? Or do we both use the

16 || public system?

17 || MR. GOLSHAN: For the LSN documents, the

18 || internal database and external database are identical.

19 || There is no differences. We have synchronized them.

20 || They are synced.

21 || So whether they use, Jessica uses the

22 || internal LSN library to search for the documents, or

23 || the external, she should get the same exact result.

24 || So it's up to her to do that. There's no difference

25 || between that. Judge Bollwerk made sure that these two

1   libraries are synced.

2   So, Jessica can look for documents that

3   are not publicly available in the internal ADAMS. You

4   cannot look at, search and find documents that are not

5   publicly available.

6   But whether Jessica uses the internal

7   ADAMS, not the LSN, to look for publicly available

8   documents or you look outside of WBA looking for the

9   same publicly available documents, you will find the

10   same documents. There is no difference between that.

11   So, whatever is that is publicly available

12   whether public searches it or staff searches it inside

13   the walls of NRC, you'll get the same documents. We,

14   of course, we as NRC people, some of us, have

15   privilege to see some non-publicly available documents

16   based on our roles in the agency.

17   MS. BORSKI: Okay.

18   MR. CAMERON: Okay, Laurie, do you have

19   further questions? I want to get them out, I want to

20   get to Jessica, I want to get to the people

21   GoToMeeting, and we can come back --

22   MS. BORSKI: Oh.

23   MR. CAMERON: -- and discuss any of those

24   further.

25   MS. BORSKI: Yes, I do actually. Some of

1 the cons, on this Cloud-based system. Rudimentary

2 search capability, document header information maybe

3 not available. That's, I'm sorry, that's a killer

4 right there. You got to have it somewhere, somehow.

5 No consolidated search capability may be

6 a killer depending on speed and the access. If I have

7 to search 12 different systems looking for things

8 versus searching one system that has them all in it,

9 that could be an issue at licensing time.

10 And, standardization of LSN accession

11 numbering scheme, I'm not sure why that wouldn't be a

12 keeper. Why we couldn't have that. But I'm not a

13 technical person, I don't know.

14 And I would think the automated audit

15 capability is also important. That's all.

16 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you for that.

17 And there's a number of issues there for us to keep

18 track of. We don't necessarily have to address them

19 now, but I think Margie wanted to make one important

20 clarification, is that true?

21 MS. JANNEY: Yes. As far as the LSN

22 public library, it is my understanding that the staff,

23 the NRC staff documents, are not in the internal

24 library because that would have been repetitive.

25 MS. BORSKI: Yes.

1   MS. JANNEY: So, those are available in

2   the ADAMS main library.

3   MR. CAMERON: Okay.

4   PARTICIPANT: But in the LSN library

5   they're integrated when you're searching.

6   MS. JANNEY: But in the LSN library

7   they're integrated when you're searching.

8   PARTICIPANT: Public LSN.

9   MS. JANNEY: The public LSN.

10   MS. BORSKI: Right, thank you.

11   MR. CAMERON: Okay. Jessica.

12   MS. BIELECKI: Thanks, Chip. We had a

13   couple clarifying questions. I'll let Tim McCartin go

14   first.

15   MR. MCCARTIN: Yes, Tim McCartin, NRC

16   staff. It gets to actually Laurie's last point. And

17   I just want to clarify, as I understand it.

18   Because you have to draw a distinction

19   between the LSN library and an LSN search. And I'm

20   assuming, as we saw demonstrated yesterday, I can do

21   an LSN search and I can, in the tree facets, select a

22   variety of the different participants. Let's DOE, Nye

23   County and Clark County.

24   And it will return that, the documents,

25   for those three participants. And that's going to be

1 true for all the options and alternatives.

2   Now, when I go to get the document, as I

3 understand it from this last presentation, one of the

4 alternatives, it might reside with Clark County's

5 Cloud portion, and so I would have to go out, the

6 system would go out to Clark County's Clouding to get

7 me the document. But that's somewhat invisible to the

8 user?

9   MR. GOLSHAN: Correct.

10   MR. MCCARTIN: Okay. So we would, all the

11 options and alternatives, you'd be able to search and

12 select whatever the different facets are, so you're

13 not doing, having to go to Clark County to search for

14 their documents?

15   MR. GOLSHAN: Except in the Option 3

16 Alternative (b). Every participant will have their

17 own collection and their own search interface. So if

18 you want to go to Clark County and find their

19 documents, the NRC will provide you a link to their

20 search portal and you go there and search their

21 documents.

22   There is no way, the way that the option

23 has been presented, there is no way to go and look at

24 a consolidated place to find that document. Again,

25 that's one implementation of the Option 3 Alternative

1   2.

2   MR. MCCARTIN: That's a very, I would say

3   a very huge deal, in my opinion. I think it's very

4   valuable to be able to search and select that and not

5   have to go out and do these separate searches.

6   And I guess, if it's possible to have some

7   type of a table in a future document that clearly

8   shows that distinction where under this option we

9   would be required to go separately, that --

10   MR. GOLSHAN: Yes, I think it's clearly,

11   Tim, I think it's clearly defined in the option paper.

12   But, again, these options have been presented. That

13   doesn't necessarily mean we're going to go and

14   implement that option. I'm going to leave it up to

15   Judge Bollwerk to qualify my answer.

16   MR. CAMERON: Do you want to qualify,

17   Paul?

18   MR. BOLLWERK: The only thing I think I'll

19   say is, that option actually was considered as part of

20   the original LSN. That was one of the things that was

21   considered by the panel.

22   It wasn't adopted for, I think, the

23   reasons you're pointing out. But it certainly was an

24   option that was put on the table, and that's what we

25   got again.

1   MR. CAMERON: Okay, great. Is there a

2   second point, Tim, or do you have something else,

3   Jessica?

4   MS. BIELECKI: Yes, if I could.

5   MR. CAMERON: Go ahead.

6   MS. BIELECKI: I think there are two quick

7   questions. Related to this search, K.G., in your

8   presentation you mentioned this would be an NRC

9   managed search database but the paper said NRC

10   developed. I just wanted to make sure that it's --

11   MR. GOLSHAN: Yes, it's actually --

12   MS. BIELECKI: -- going to be different

13   from ADAMS, the ADAMS search we saw yesterday.

14   MR. GOLSHAN: Actually, Gary, as part of

15   the staff, technical expert, he brought that to my

16   attention and we thought that we'll have a clarifying

17   answer here in this meeting. Yes, I guess it's a bad

18   choice of words, that's the only thing I can say.

19   It's, we don't develop it, no. The

20   current LSN library, we didn't develop it. We

21   acquired it, it's out of the box, we implemented it.

22   So, yes. And we're not going to sit in

23   there and develop something that it's so mature and

24   other people have --

25   MS. BIELECKI: Okay. And then related to

1 the cost questions earlier, as Brad had mentioned, the

2 participant costs are included but there are costs for

3 NRC staff as a participant. Do you have information

4 on how you generated that or --

5   MR. GOLSHAN: That, the best guess, those

6 have been, all the FDA costs have been, as part of the

7 costs are listed there.

8   MS. BIELECKI: But for NRC staff as a

9 party? We're just wondering where those numbers came

10 --

11   MR. GOLSHAN: Yes.

12   MS. BIELECKI: -- from and how that would

13 work out since we weren't involved in the development

14 of the paper.

15   MR. GOLSHAN: Yes, I don't know. I'm not

16 qualified to answer that question.

17   MS. BIELECKI: Okay.

18   MR. CAMERON: But the point --

19   MR. GOLSHAN: I don't know who wants to

20 take that.

21   MR. CAMERON: -- concerns --

22   MS. BIELECKI: Understanding the staff

23 costs.

24   MR. CAMERON: -- the staff costs.

25   MS. BIELECKI: Yes.

1   MR. CAMERON: My very important point, but

2   I guess we're not sure how it was considered, but it

3   has to be reflected.

4   MS. BIELECKI: Yes.

5   MR. CAMERON: In the discussion.

6   MS. BIELECKI: There is numbers in the

7   paper, so we would just like to understand how the

8   numbers were developed. The basis. So we know what

9   we would be responsible for.

10   MR. CAMERON: And that's similar to what

11 we heard from other ARP members in terms of, have

12 their costs for implementing these options been

13 considered. Go ahead, Paul. Paul Bollwerk.

14   MR. BOLLWERK: I'm told by Andy Welkie,

15 who had lots to do with drafting the paper, along with

16 K.G., that basically that was the implementation cost

17 for the agency, not necessarily for individual parties

18 which were not included as NRC staff.

19   MR. CAMERON: Okay.

20   MR. BOLLWERK: It was basically how the

21 agency was put into place, not including the

22 individual party.

23   MR. CAMERON: So there was at least

24 uniform treatment in the sense that party's costs were

25 not included. And I think what all of you have been

1 saying, is that you need to have those costs laid out

2 to consider options.

3 And, are you, is that all?

4 MS. BIELECKI: Just a follow-up. Like on

5 Page 33 of the paper it has a table and the separate

6 part of the table it says, NRC staff collection as a

7 participant. So are you saying that that's the agency

8 cost not for NRC staff?

9 MR. CAMERON: Did you hear the question?

10 Most recent question.

11 Okay, we're having a little caucus here

12 for those of you on GoToMeeting. And, Judy, I'm going

13 to go to the GoToMeeting people and then we'll come

14 back to you because I want to make sure that they get

15 a chance to participate.

16 Did you hear Jessica's last question?

17 MS. JANNEY: Yes.   And we'd like to

18 confer.

19 MS. BIELECKI: Okay, thanks.

20 MR. CAMERON: Okay.

21 MS. BIELECKI: That's it.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. And do we

23 have anybody on, any ARP member on through GoToMeeting

24 that wants to talk to us at this point on any issue

25 related to Option 3, including some of the things that

1   we've been discussing?

2   MR. KLEVORICK: Yes. Phil Klevorick,

3   Clark County.

4   MR. CAMERON: Hi, Phil.

5   MR. KLEVORICK: First thing is the phone

6   line peeps dropping the sound and I don't know what

7   conversations have been going on. So, there's a lot

8   of missed comments on my end.

9   So, I'm not going to blame you guys, I'm

10   going to blame Clark County, but it could be your end,

11   I'm not sure.

12   But, if I'm a little redundant on some of

13   the things that may have been said, I'm going to

14   apologize up front.

15   MR. CAMERON: Well, we apologize if

16   there's any problem for you hearing everything. And,

17   our technical people are conferring now to see if

18   there's something that we could do to prevent that

19   from happening.

20   MR. KLEVORICK: We'll I'm actually now

21   calling in on the audio conference line which was

22   provided to me which is probably a good help.

23   But, going forward, can you go to slide

24   152, please?

25   MR. CAMERON: Okay, slide 152, we're going

1 to try to get that up.

2   MR. KLEVORICK: Because, there's a couple

3 things I want to make sure get addressed as well.

4   I think it would be better if you numbered

5 these options as Option 3 A, B and C, that would be

6 the first thing. Because, I think it's going to be

7 confusing if somebody forgets to mention it's A or B

8 under Option 3. So, that would be a little bit better

9 for everybody to understand the consistency on the

10 numbering system.

11   But, I wanted to point out a couple things

12 why Clark County would not -- for Option, as it's

13 listed, 2 A and 2B. And, I want to make sure if this

14 gets at least noted.

15   One, is   that   there   is   probably

16 restrictions on peoples abilities to get into other

17 peoples server. And, I think that that would be a

18 problem if there is a server that goes down and

19 somebody wants to get access to, let's say, the Clark

20 County server, and let's say, the server goes down and

21 they don't have the capability of obtaining the

22 documents they're looking for.

23   So, I think that that could be a problem.

24   The second part of that, which I think

25 absolutely needs to be addressed is that, if we go to

1   a local entity or a party for maintaining their own

2   documents and the funding gets eliminated, kind of

3   what's happened the last seven, eight years, there may

4   not be an ability to keep that system going in the

5   interim.

6   And, if that becomes a problem, how would

7   that impact our ability to participate if -- I mean,

8   a requirement under the 10 CFR?

9   MR. CAMERON: And, I think that -- I think

10   that the important point is what you're pointing out

11   is that is our disadvantages associated with that.

12   Because, I don't know what would -- I

13   don't know -- I mean, it would not be helpful to have

14   that happen. Correct, Paul?

15   MR. BOLLWERK: Yes, it could have been a

16   problem under the old LSN. I mean, in theory, they

17   would be withholding their own documents if the

18   servers went down.

19   MR. CAMERON: And, can you hear that?

20   Paul Bollwerk's going to --

21   MR. BOLLWERK: The only thing I would say

22   is that, again, that could have been a problem under

23   the old LSN. If peoples servers went down for

24   whatever reason, they were offline and their documents

25   weren't available.

1   Because, again, all the LSN had were the

2   indices, they did not have the actual documents. You

3   did your search, click, then it went out to nowhere

4   and did not respond.

5   Certainly, there were things within the

6   rules that if there were problems, certain, you know,

7   if something was unavailable, you -- that data to the

8   hearing process, deal with the CAB or with the

9   Commission.

10   But, obviously, you want to have

11   continuous access to the document. That's always a

12   problem with a distributed database system is it all

13   has to work properly.

14   MR. KLEVORICK: Right. So, if I can

15   actually just tag onto that, Paul. For example, like

16   go back to my first point.

17   If the counties, in my case, doesn't --

18   don't get funding like we haven't had in eight years

19   or more, and we don't have the ability to maintain the

20   system, what happens?

21   MR. CAMERON: Can we address that

22   question? I mean, what would -- Paul Bollwerk just

23   indicated that there are things that could be adjusted

24   in or accommodated in the hearing process.

25   But, what you're suggesting, Phil, and

1 correct me if I'm wrong, is that because of funding

2 issues, you no longer could maintain the system for

3 other parties to search on.

4 So, what would happen to them as a party?

5 And, I know, K.G. wants to add something, but go

6 ahead, Paul.

7 MR. KLEVORICK: Well, if I could just

8 clarify that. Let's just go back through the history

9 of eight years ago when the AULGs, as an example, were

10 getting funding and other people were getting some

11 funding, we were able to maintain the requirement as

12 expected for our requirements and keep the LSN active.

13 But, when the funding disappeared, and,

14 I'm going to put this out there, several of the AULGs

15 don't even have staff, let alone equipment.

16 So, the first thing that, you know, their

17 capabilities would have been significantly distressed.

18 And, keep in mind of everything else that

19 was going on with the economy, that there was no need

20 to keep it going and they had no ability to keep it

21 going. They would not keep it going.

22 And, luckily, in this case, is that the

23 NRC stepped up and said, hey, send us their documents

24 and we'll keep the database going.

25 That wasn't the case. I'm going to

1   propose that -- or postulate, I guess, for example,

2   that a significant number of the people who have

3   servers or would have servers, would not have been

4   able to continue on providing that data.

5   MR. GOLSHAN: So, Phil, if I may, this is

6   K.G., I wanted to just kind of bring to your

7   attention, Judge Bollwerk says, again, the old LSN, if

8   the parties' connections were not available, that

9   documents would not be accessible. That is correct.

10   However, using a cloud storage, a

11 possibility of that happening is very remote because

12 they -- the cloud providers usually have redundancies

13 built so that situation does not happen.

14   So, the only thing that really

15 participants have to agree upon is the arrangement

16 with the cloud provider and then getting the documents

17 there and keeping it up to date.

18   But, you know, but as long as they make

19 the payments or whatever, that -- the collection will

20 be available and the redundancies around that is all

21 built.

22   And, that's a good point Joe Daiker

23 (phonetic) brought it to my attention that we should

24 have mentioned that. So, I'm going to be -- defer to

25 Judge Bollwerk.

1   MR. BOLLWERK: The only thing I think I

2   would add is, again, with any distributed database

3   where you have the individual parties holding their

4   own collections, and it's important that that

5   information be available to everyone, is subject to

6   the funding that the parties have.

7   I think one of the assumptions with it --

8   with this overall option is that, the proceeding were

9   to restart and this will become operative, that, in

10   theory, everybody would have the money again. But, if

11   they don't, then that's an issue.

12   Obviously, a distributed database would

13   raise that issue. So, again, you have to bear that in

14   mind.   Although, based on what happened last time,

15   there was money there, as you pointed out, Phil. And,

16   I guess the assumption is that would happen again.

17   But, any distributed database is going to have that

18   problem when you're talking about individual parties

19   having to run an important part of the system.

20   MR. CAMERON: Okay.

21   MR. KLEVORICK: And, if I could just

22   finish out that the -- and the burden is tough on the

23   smaller participants. As Rod pointed out, they have

24   a significant investment they have to put in.

25   And, I'm sure Bob is the same way and

1 things like that.

2   But, the AULGs, we just don't have the

3 capabilities to look at trying to carry over

4 capabilities on the presumption that we would get

5 money sometime in the future. Because, that sometime

6 in the future, we don't know the deadline and

7 dateline.

8   And, I just want to make sure that that --

9 I get all the semantics that are involved and I'm just

10 saying I want to make sure aware of why I would not

11 support 3 A and B as is listed.

12   MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks, Phil. I think

13 that that's great food for thought for the staff in

14 going forward with the options.

15   Is there anybody else on to GoToMeeting?

16   MR. LACY: This is Darrell Lacy, I just

17 want to say that I agree with Phil and Rod McCullum

18 and Bob Halstead, which is that --

19   MR. CAMERON: Is this --

20   MR. LACY: -- there's some additional risk

21 involved in this. That, I think as I mentioned

22 yesterday, I don't see where the additional risk,

23 additional time and everything is beneficial,

24 especially to the small participants.

25   For some of you, it's only managed in a

1 few documents. It just makes no sense of all to have

2 any kind of participant maintained system whether it's

3 on the cloud or individual servers.

4 I don't have a huge problem if the

5 Department of Energy wants to maintain their own

6 system as transparent to the rest of the users. But,

7 at least to the rest of us, I just don't see where it

8 makes any sense at all.

9 Thanks.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks. Thanks,

11 Darrell, you have the same concerns as Phil does.

12 Thank you for that.

13 Anybody else on GoToMeeting?

14 (OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)

15 MS. SIMKINS: This is Connie Simkins,

16 Lincoln County.

17 I agree with Darrell.

18 MR. CAMERON: Okay, great. Thanks,

19 Connie.

20 So, there's three similar feelings. Okay?

21 MS. PITCHFORD: Loreen Pitchford, Lander

22 County.

23 MR. CAMERON: Yes?

24 MS. PITCHFORD: Can you hear me?

25 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

1 | MS. PITCHFORD: Okay. I was going to --

2 | I mean, I'm an office out of Watt, but is there a

3 | possibility of doing an Option 3 C? And, what that

4 | would be is we would maintain the current ADAMS Public

5 | Library, the existing one with improvements. And

6 | then, the NRC would have a combined cloud collection

7 | with all the participants' documents and, would be

8 | maintained by the NRC.

9 | That way, I think there's quite a few

10 | smaller amount of documents that would existing in the

11 | cloud. And, I recognize it would be two different

12 | places that you would have to search, but that

13 | wouldn't be 12 different places.

14 | So, it would be the ADAMS as it exists now

15 | and a cloud -- a combined collection of all the

16 | participants with new -- the new material that would

17 | be added going forward.

18 | MR. CAMERON: So, this is just to -- and

19 | I think K.G. is going to respond to that -- but just

20 | so that we understand that -- or that I understand

21 | that is -- and this is Loreen, correct?

22 | MS. PITCHFORD: Yes.

23 | MR. CAMERON: Yes, Loreen, you would

24 | maintain and, with improvements, the existing ADAMS

25 | LSN Library and any new documents would be captured on

1   the cloud. So, it's sort of another alternative,

2   could be another alternative under Option 2.

3   So, go ahead K.G.

4   MR. GOLSHAN: Yes, I personally don't,

5   and, of course, I'm not the right person to see

6   benefits in it or not.

7   I personally don't see any, you know, any

8   added benefits to that.

9   Alternative 1 of the Option 3 has a

10   consolidated search database that is located in the

11   cloud and you basically provide us with the new

12   documents then we put it all in one place for

13   everybody to search.

14   That is a cloud option. And, if the

15   Option 2 is selected, of course, the new documents

16   will be incorporated in a single repository that is

17   currently available, of course, with improvements and

18   it will be searchable by everybody else.

19   Yes, we could possibly present what you're

20   recommending as an Option 3 C or whatever. And, then

21   put it up for a vote, I guess.

22   But, that means that you still have to go

23   to two places to search for your documents. You're

24   not going to go to one place and search and find all

25   your documents in one place.

1   MR. CAMERON: Okay. And, I would like to

2   thank all the counties for speaking up now. I don't

3   know if we have anybody else. We'll go back to the

4   table to Judy and then Bob Halstead.

5   And, I have to say that the best thing

6   that I saw this morning was the ends of Archie's dog

7   who joined us.

8   (LAUGHTER)

9   MR. CAMERON: Judy?

10   MS. TREICHEL: This is just for

11   clarification to K.G., you said that right now there

12   is an NRC initiative to put everything that you have

13   in a cloud system.

14   And, I wanted to know if you have a

15   particular provider for that service that has met all

16   the requirements of the government and NRC?

17   And, if you do, then if participants are

18   going to make their collections available

19   individually, are there constraints on them as well?

20   Do they have to get particular providers that have

21   this sort of whatever, stamp of approval from the

22   government and the NRC?

23   MR. GOLSHAN: So, let me answer the first

24   question. There is an initiative going on. It's kind

25   of -- we're kind of early on in the process.

1   There are -- some of the platforms are

2 very much productized, you know, like, for example,

3 email is a product; it's a commodity, it's

4 commoditized.

5   So, for moving an email to a software as

6 a service kind of an arrangement which we're doing it

7 with Azure, it's a, you know, Office 365, I'm pretty

8 sure you've heard about it. That's a cloud service.

9   As that was rather easy and is part of,

10 you know, it's commoditized and the parameters on it

11 are well-defined and so that was an easy proposition

12 for us.

13   We have certain requirements and we have

14 to go through process of comparing pros and cons of

15 the could providers.

16   For our external website, we are right now

17 in the process of doing it.

18   And, also, there is within the enterprise

19 architecture a team of the OCIO, there is a group that

20 are specially assigned the task of studying for the

21 transitioning.

22   Of course, this is a very, very

23 incremental process, as you can imagine. You can't

24 just lift everything and put it in the cloud in one

25 day.

1   So, they're, yes, they're studying it. We

2   don't know whether we're going to have one cloud

3   provider. If I was a betting man, I would tell you,

4   we will probably have multiple cloud providers for

5   different cloud forms. So, they're studying that.

6   And then, of course, they're coming to us

7   as, you know, solution providers and having the

8   responsibility of operating our platforms to telling

9   us what our requirements are.

10   So, yes, it's a lengthy process. And,

11   we're going to come with it.

12   So, that's the first part of your

13   question.

14   The second part of your question is that

15   will mandate you to go to a particular cloud provider

16   to host your collection.

17   Now, that's not a very easy question to

18   answer. All I can tell you, there's a certain level

19   of standardization is required. Right? So, we cannot

20   have 15 different ways of pushing your collections for

21   indexing and searchability and all of that and 15

22   different ways of retrieving, you know, these

23   documents.

24   So, this is going to be, again, based on

25   your recommendation, is that having a team of

1 expertise to kind of elaborate on that and come up

2 with something that is going to amenable by all the

3 parties. And then, of course, we go to that.

4 But, the key thing is that we have to

5 follow the mandates that the federal government, as

6 these facilities have to follow a certain security,

7 you know, controls. They have, you know, they have to

8 be fed ram certified.

9 And, there's quite a few of them, like,

10 for example, we just subscribed to could provider for,

11 which is a storage cloud storage and a way for us to,

12 you know, transfer information. It's called Box.

13 You know, I use it to have access to my

14 granddaughter's pictures. But, then, you know, I

15 mean, it's also been, you know, they have an

16 enterprise version of it which is very secure. The

17 information is maintained, encrypted address, and in

18 transit.

19 So, again, yes, it is something that we

20 have to collectively come to agreement.

21 MS. TREICHEL: Okay, I would love it if we

22 could leave this meeting with, I guess, one of our

23 homework projects is to write back our feelings about

24 the options and that sort of thing.

25 But, I would really like to think that

1 there will be a meeting with a chance to talk to one

2 or more people that have all the technical expertise

3 you're talking about so that the participants can

4 figure out their times and costs and the constraints

5 and the requirements that they would have.

6 And then, they can actually come up with

7 the determination and make their decisions about

8 whether or not to have NRC keep everything.

9 I'm a fan of having it distributed and I

10 would like to see NRC have as little to do with it as

11 possible, both for your protection and for ours

12 because I think there is skepticism and there's people

13 worry that there's a fix in, you know.

14 So, I would like to see that. And, it's

15 really true, it's out there. But, if it's cost

16 prohibitive and all of these issues come up like what

17 Phil and the other counties mentioned, and it just

18 becomes a very large difference in cost, we won't know

19 that until we've got somebody familiar with the whole

20 thing that can --

21 MR. CAMERON: Okay, that's sort of a good

22 summary --

23 MS. TREICHEL: Okay.

24 MR. CAMERON: -- Judy, of what needs to be

25 done. There are participant costs on all of these

1 options, need to be factored in and the determination

2 of those costs might take conversations between

3 experts in the technology plus the NRC experts and the

4 parties to figure out those costs.

5 Now, that's going to be reflected in the

6 transcript and that's going to be used by the NRC LSN

7 staff when they write the Commission paper.

8 But, certainly, any of these issues that

9 you're concerned about, anything that you've heard

10 other parties or other members of the ARP raise, such

11 as what we heard from the counties, if you want to put

12 that in writing in the comments that you submit 14

13 days after we have the transcript, please do that.

14 That would be very helpful for the staff.

15 I'm going to make a suggestion that we --

16 let's go to Bob and Rod. I really want to check in

17 with the public, though, to see if they have any --

18 let me check in with the public.

19 MR. MCCULLUM: I'm happy waiting for the

20 public.

21 MR. CAMERON: Pardon me?

22 MR. MCCULLUM: I'm perfectly happy waiting

23 for the public, so check there first. This is just a

24 reminder.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's see if the

1 | public who's on through the either GoToWebinar and

2 | we'll check with Saima to see if anybody is on by

3 | phone.

4 | But, who do we have that wants to talk

5 | from GoToWebinar?

6 | (NO RESPONSE)

7 | OPERATOR: If you'd like to speak at this

8 | time or make a comment or ask a question, please press

9 | star one.

10 | I'm showing no questions over the phone at

11 | this time.

12 | MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Saima.

13 | Okay, oh, okay, and anybody that is on

14 | through GoToWebinar, please raise your hand, so to

15 | speak, if you want to talk and we're going to check

16 | back in to see if anybody did raise their hand.

17 | But, let me go here in the room to Bob

18 | Halstead and then we'll talk -- we'll go to Rod.

19 | Bob?

20 | MR. HALSTEAD: Yes, Martie reminds me that

21 | this is a good point for us to remember that, in all

22 | the detailed discussions we're having about three

23 | different ways or more even possibly to operate

24 | through a cloud based system, in the end, what's

25 | really important is that we have a search capability

1   that meets those functional requirements so that we

2   can, A, find documents, and B, once we find the

3   documents, search the documents.

4   And, I think that's a -- we can

5   qualitatively, I don't know how we quantitatively,

6   evaluate these options, but, I think that's the -- the

7   more decentralized your operation is, whether it's in

8   the cloud or whether it's in the public ADAMS, the end

9   question is whether that search capability is there.

10   And, I think that's a particular problem

11 with the option of participant maintained search

12 indexes. And, it seems to me, it has to be a problem

13 when you have an NRC maintained search index trying to

14 interface with different participant document

15 collections.

16   But, I think -- does that capture it,

17 Martie?

18   MR. MALSCH: Well, yes, I mean --

19   MR. HALSTEAD: Why don't you come up and

20 --

21   MR. MALSCH: We had spent lots of time

22 yesterday discussing --

23   (OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)

24   MR. MALSCH: We had spent lots of time

25 yesterday discussing search difficulties with the

1 current ADAMS LSN. And, there was some discussion

2 about how it may be improved or should be improved.

3 But, with respect to all the alternatives

4 dealing -- using the cloud, as I read the options

5 paper, the search capability or interface is not

6 defined, that's to be chosen.

7 And so, in terms of the issues we

8 discussed yesterday, it's impossible to make a

9 comparison at this point because the options simply

10 are not defined.

11 That was my only point.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Well, that's a good

13 point and it just reminds me of what Loreen Pitchford

14 said is, maintain ADAMS LSN, improve ADAMS LSN and you

15 only put new documents on the could.

16 Martie's point still applies, but at least

17 you have the search capability of an improved ADAMS

18 LSN.

19 But, whether that makes any sense to deal

20 with the new documents that way is another question.

21 But, thank you, Martie.

22 And, Rod?

23 MR. MCCULLUM: Yes, I just want to put an

24 exclamation point on some of the things that have been

25 said by Nevada, Lincoln County, Inyo County and Clark

1   County, you know, and I kind of started this

2   discussion, but I think it's become resonate.

3   And, I want to bring it back to the rank

4   summary which is that slide 147 on my thing that's up.

5   It's 152 here. I don't know what we're missing.

6   Anyway, but the point I want to make here

7   is that, you know, Laurie started us off here by

8   talking about some of the risks in the context that

9   these could be killers.

10   And, you know, I think Martie brought back

11 -- well, it just brought us back to the uncertainty

12 here that, you know, we think these are killers and we

13 also think that we would agree with the counties. The

14 costs are substantial and that they would difficult

15 for some of the counties. They would be equally

16 difficult for NEI.

17   And so, to get back to the rank summary

18 table which is where I really want to make this point.

19 You know, we already see here pretty clear separation

20 in terms of the scores.

21   You see the first three options are

22 huddled around 10, 11. Then, you break up into the

23 20s with the exception of one that's still hovering at

24 13 in Option 3.

25   But, those numbers in green don't consider

1 | the participant costs that I think we've all agreed

2 | are substantial. And, I think they may also

3 | understate the risks, particularly given what Laurie

4 | had said.

5 | So, if you were to factor in this

6 | discussion to those numbers in green, I think we'd see

7 | even more separation between, you know, the Option 1

8 | and 2 scores.

9 | And, overall, I'm complementing NRC on

10 | this rank summary. I think this is kind of the right

11 | way to look at it. And, I think what we're doing in

12 | this meeting is identifying those things that are

13 | missing from it.

14 | And, I think in this area, in cost and

15 | risk, we have identified that a lot is missing. So,

16 | I hope that that would be reflected going forward.

17 | MR. CAMERON: Okay, good point. And, it

18 | will be.

19 | And, I want to get Ian's Zabarte on right

20 | now before we do anything else.

21 | Go ahead, Ian.

22 | MR. ZABARTE: Good morning, this is Ian

23 | Zabarte in Las Vegas.

24 | We've been at a disadvantage from the

25 | beginning of this project. And, as I mentioned

1 yesterday, we've got -- there is an element of

2 environmental racism at work here.

3 So, whichever option is chosen, we're

4 already at a disadvantage.

5 And, about funding, we believe that the

6 process is already prejudiced against the Shoshone.

7 I just wanted to state that either way we go, we're at

8 a disadvantage without proper support to participate.

9 We will continue to maintain that this process is

10 abuse.

11 Thanks.

12 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Ian. I'm

13 not going to use the term environment racism, but I

14 think there's plenty of federal policies that

15 recognize the special rights of at least Tribal Nation

16 sovereignty and --

17 MR. ZABARTE: But, I could add to to

18 clarify what you're trying to get to. Yes, there's

19 funding for federally recognized tribes as well as the

20 Timbisha Shoshone Tribe.

21 However, they're limited to the

22 reservation's boundary. You do not assert ownership

23 to Yucca Mountain.

24 And, we want to just clarify that, from my

25 perspective, the Department of Energy, the Nuclear

1 Regulatory Commission and the government's energy are

2 indistinguishable in the perpetration of this crime.

3 We believe there are crimes committed and

4 that's where we're taking this. So, I want to clarify

5 that. We are not funded, we don't seek funding as a

6 federally recognized tribe, but we will participate

7 and we'll prosecute our concerns all the way through

8 the process.

9 Thank you.

10 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,

11 Ian. Special attention.

12 Do we have anybody else who wants to talk

13 on this option? Because, if not, we'll go to Option

14 4.

15 But, I've just got to check in with you.

16 And, we have Margie, who's the Acting LSN

17 Administrator.

18 Did we ventilate this federal policy on

19 the cloud enough? Are we done with that? I heard the

20 point that Bob was going to raise. And, do we need to

21 discuss it, is another question?

22 But, let me hear from Margie.

23 MS. JANNEY: This goes back to Jessica's

24 question with consultation with my colleagues, the

25 funding costs and time that we came up with for the

1   NRC staff's collection was from knowledge from OCIO as

2   to how much it would cost to put your current

3   collection online in this manner, but not your staff

4   costs.

5   Because we don't have a clue as to staff

6   costs.

7   We also don't have a clue as to staff

8   costs with anyone else, any of the other participants

9   as well as we don't know how much it would cost for

10   you to put up your own servers up in the cloud, not on

11   the cloud, because we don't know what rules and

12   regulations the State of Nevada has or Clark County.

13   We have some idea of what DOE has,

14   requirements, because they have the exact same federal

15   requirements we do.   But, we can't make those

16   determinations without details of your situations.

17   But, so, that, to answer your question,

18   Jessica, it was only the server costs to load and add

19   the documents.

20   MR. GOLSHAN: And, does that cost of OCIO?

21   Also, as you're aware, there's a whole exercise going

22   on right now as we speak in that that, you know, takes

23   into consideration and the staff costs from NMSS and

24   other people.

25   So, I think that we didn't see it

1   appropriate to be included in the option paper for

2   that.

3   MS. JANNEY: That's helpful, thanks.

4   MR. CAMERON: And, I just take us back to

5   what Judy said earlier is that this type of

6   information that you're talking about is that people

7   are going to have to get together, Judy used the term

8   experts, with the ARP members to try to figure out

9   equipment availability, costs, the whole deal.

10   Rod, go ahead.

11   MR. MCCULLUM: Yes, I want to actually go

12   back to, and thank you, Chip, for offering the

13   opportunity to get back to the question that Bob

14   raised about the government policy on the cloud.

15   And, I found, you know, Margie's read the

16   whole sentence clarification a while ago to be

17   extremely useful. And, it -- in that we were talking

18   about when the government creates something new.

19   And, in the case of all -- everything in

20   Option 3, yes, we're creating something new.

21   In the case of Option 4, we would be

22   creating something that's been dead for a while,

23   again, whether that's new or not, we'll get into that

24   discussion this afternoon.

25   But, in the case of Option 1, we're not

1 really creating anything at all, we're going back, you

2 know, to traditional discovery.

3 And, also, in the case of Option 2, the

4 thing there, we're not recreating something that's

5 dead. The thing that's not new is ADAMS, not the LSN.

6 And so, the question of are we creating something new

7 needs to be asked with respect to what we're building

8 on which is ADAMS.

9 Now, if NRC is going to take ADAMS to the

10 cloud, I guess we come along with it. But, I think,

11 you know, the electronic information exchange we've

12 built, that goes there, too. And, it becomes seamless

13 to the participants.

14 I'm assuming a lot and I'm getting out of

15 my area of expertise, that's why I'm looking at this

16 guy over here.

17 But, you know, so, I think that discussion

18 is probably not as relevant on Options 1 and 2 as it

19 is on Options 3 and 4. And, again, to me, I would

20 want to focus that is it new question on ADAMS, not on

21 the LSN.

22 MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you for that.

23 And, I think there's agreement here.

24 Margie, do you want to say something

25 before we go to Bob for a final comment on Option 3?

1   No?

2   MS. JANNEY: No, thank you.

3   MR. CAMERON: Good, I mean, I don't mean

4   good, but, Bob?

5   MR. HALSTEAD: I think the point is we

6   might all have opinions on how OMB will interpret and

7   apply OMB's language.   There is a considerable

8   uncertainty as to how that policy directive will

9   affect anything that you propose and I don't want to

10   go any further with it. But, it's one of life's many

11   unknowns dealing with OMB.

12   MR. CAMERON: And, good point. And, what

13   you can do in cases like this is there must have been

14   interpretations, rulings on this application of this

15   particular policy. And, some of it might have dealt

16   with those issues. So, that might want to be looked

17   at.

18   I'm going to ask Andy how we're doing. I

19   think we're done with Option 3.

20   CHAIRMAN BATES: We're done with Option 3

21   pretty much.

22   I think on the schedule, we had talked

23   about doing lunch about 12:15, but we could press

24   ahead with Option 4 at this point and see how that

25   goes.

1   MR. CAMERON: Well, let me see if -- do we

2   need a --

3   CHAIRMAN BATES: A break?

4   MR. CAMERON: -- break? Okay.

5   Why don't we take ten minutes and come

6   back at ten minutes to noon. We'll start Option 4 and

7   maybe that won't be as complex as Option 3 was, but

8   we'll see where we are then.

9   But, take ten minutes. And, for those of

10   you who are on through GoToMeeting and I thank Ian and

11   the counties for their comments. We're going to take

12   a ten minute break.

13   (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went

14   off the record at 11:39 a.m. and resumed at 11:52

15   a.m.)

16   MR. CAMERON: Okay, two -- before we go to

17   Option 4, I just wanted to mention two things.

18   One is for the record, the availability of

19   the transcript is going to be sent by email to all of

20   you that we've been in contact with before.

21   And then, it won't be attached to the

22   email.

23   (OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)

24   MR. CAMERON: Probably not, but it might

25   be.

1   (OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)

2   MR. CAMERON: Okay. And then, there's

3   going to be an opportunity 14 days for written

4   comments. And, we're thinking that the transcript

5   might be available by next Tuesday or so.

6   And, I know Sam or whatever the contract

7   requirements are, he'll have that done. So, for the

8   record.

9   (OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)

10   MR. CAMERON: Okay. But, you won't send

11   the email until it's posted?

12   (OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)

13   MR. CAMERON: Okay.

14   Second announcement is, we were thinking

15   that we might try to go through Option 4, okay, and

16   discussion. And, check back in with people about

17   costs. We've heard a lot about that and check back in

18   with you about that.

19   And then, we're going to hear from Margie,

20   Paul Bollwerk and Andy's going to ask you to view for

21   your opinions on options. Okay?

22   But, we're going to try to finish all that

23   and end the meeting early rather than taking a lunch

24   break and coming back for, you know, what might only

25   be a half hour or something like that.

1   And, I just wanted to check in, does

2   anybody have a big objection to trying to just push

3   through and finish early?

4   MR. MCCULLUM: No, Chip, I want to second

5   your motion to push through.

6   (LAUGHTER)

7   MR. CAMERON: Okay. You don't have to

8   sound so enthusiastic about it, but okay.

9   (LAUGHTER)

10   MR. CAMERON: We're going to go now to

11   Margie who's going to talk about Option 4.

12   MS. JANNEY: Good morning, I'm Margie

13   Janney, the Acting LSN Administrator.

14   (OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)

15   MS. JANNEY: Good morning. I'm Margie

16   Janney, the Acting LSN Administrator.

17   Option 4 is to rebuild the original LSN,

18   meeting all functional requirements that were found in

19   the original project definition and analysis document.

20   The following assumptions are made for the

21   rebuilding the original LSN option. The basis for

22   system development would be the project definition and

23   analysis document for the original licensing support

24   network.

25   High level waste participant websites will

1 be available on a timely basis for crawling by the new

2 LSN.

3   Once the header and document collection is

4 available through a reconstituted LSN, the NRC would

5 decommission the public ADAMS LSN Library. Copies of

6 those records will remain in possession of the NRC for

7 federal records management purposes.

8   The original LSN was a distributed system

9 in which a centralized indexing system operated and

10 maintained by ASLBP reached out to high level waste

11 participant sites and crawled each participant's

12 collection of headers and documents.

13   The configuration of high level waste

14 participant IT systems met a set of rigorous standards

15 to ensure compatibility with the original LSN

16 spidering system.

17   A set of LSN guidelines was developed and

18 provided guidance to the high level waste participants

19 on the operation of LSN functionality.

20   The original LSN comprised three major

21 functions, auditing, indexing and searching and

22 retrieving available records.

23   Auditing by the LSN ensured document

24 integrity and reported various performance metrics.

25   LSN spiders crawled the participants'

1   sites, creating indexes that catalogued the various

2   documents and headers.

3   The original LSN provided the mechanisms

4   to search the headers and documents by key words,

5   phrases and important concepts in a natural language

6   manner.

7   The new LSN would be designed using the

8   same components to undertake the three major

9   functions. The new LSN would also maintain the five

10 major subsystems of the original LSN, fetch

11 participants documents and headers.

12   This process would index the content of

13 each participant's site.

14   Audit participant sites. This process

15 would detect new and changed participants' documents,

16 measure participants' site availability and build

17 statistical reports from participant document

18 activity.

19   Search LSN content. This process would

20 provide priority and public users one central location

21 from which to conduct simple and complex searches for

22 documents across all participant sites.

23   Administer the LSN. This process would

24 allow administrative users to view audit reports,

25 maintain password lists and sustain other LSN

1 functions. It would run across a secure connection.

2 Access LSN website. This process would

3 provide a log in for priority and administrative

4 access.

5 (OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)

6 MS. JANNEY: So, this is a general

7 depiction of the LAN where, on the bottom, is the

8 ASLBP owned LSN search portal and the index. And,

9 that would go out and across to the Department of

10 Energy and all of the other participants including the

11 NRC staff.

12 And, the user up in the right hand corner

13 could search the LSN and would actually get the

14 document from the individual participant site.

15 The NRC would provide a search interface

16 that, when specific search criteria are entered, would

17 search an NEC maintained index of each participants'

18 header and document collection.

19 When the request is made to view the

20 document, the search interface would redirect the user

21 to the participant's collection to present the

22 document for viewing, much like Google does.

23 This slide provides an estimate for the

24 costs and time associated with rebuilding the original

25 LSN. It based on current information and is intended

1   to provide a consistent comparison basis between the

2   other options.

3   ASLBP would incur the cost of the system

4   development which are more than any of the other

5   options. The recurring cost to maintain the LSN are

6   estimated to be in about the middle of the pack.

7   The rough time estimate for implementation

8   of this rebuild the original LSN option is longer than

9   any of the other options.

10   Our   time   and   cost   estimates   are

11 undetermined for each high level waste participant.

12 As each participant may have different IT policies in

13 place for the procurement and implementation of an IT

14 solution.

15   Activities associated with implementing

16 the   solution   includes   such   activities   and   IT

17 governance and contract actions, technical solution

18 design,   system   development,   implementation   and

19 testing.

20   Participants need to remember how much

21 cost and effort they put into building their systems

22 and loading their documents back in the early 2000s.

23 This option will clearly take the most time and cost

24 for participants.

25   Plus, the rebuilt LSN must be maintained

1   by each participant until all licensing actions are

2   complete through potential possession and closure.

3   Risk score is calculated based on the

4   impact and the likelihood of occurrence of the six

5   risks at the bottom of the table -- bottom of the

6   slide.

7   The model for the development of

8   reconstituting the LSN in its original state is well

9   documented and a validated set of functional

10 requirements exists.

11   Those functional requirements would only

12 require minor updates as noted in Appendix A of the

13 options paper.

14   The IT system implementation risk of this

15 option lies not with the ability to develop a

16 solution, but with the time and the cost associated

17 with that development.

18   It is estimated that the IT risk of this

19 option is moderate. However, the risks associated

20 with cost and schedule are high.

21   In this regard, perhaps the largest

22 looming challenging exists in building an identical

23 system environment given the changes in federal IT

24 policy since the early 2000s when the original LSN was

25 designed and constructed.

1   The LSN, as originally constituted, had a

2   unique web domain name which was lsnnet.gov. It

3   utilized multiple physical computer servers and was

4   housed in a non-government data center.

5   Today, federal regulations require sites

6   administered by federal agencies to be located on a

7   dot-gov subsite of the agency and to be evaluated for

8   a cloud solution, which rules out physical computers

9   and an offsite data center.

10   The federal government has adopted a cloud

11 first policy that the Office of Management and Budget

12 states, quote, is intended to accelerate the pace at

13 which the government will realize the value of cloud

14 computing by requiring agencies to evaluate safe,

15 secure cloud computing options before making any new

16 investments.

17   Further, OMB Memorandum M-16-19 states

18 that consistent with the cloud first policy, agencies

19 shall use cloud infrastructure where possible when

20 planning new mission or support applications for

21 consolidating existing applications.

22   Rebuilding the original LSN would be a new

23 mission application investment, unlike Option 2, which

24 is modifying an existing application.

25   As discussed in Option 3, move to the

1 cloud, a cloud based system is a viable alternative to

2 the original LSN design.

3 Reconstitution of the original LSN, as

4 designed and implemented in 2000, therefore, arguably,

5 would be inconsistent with the changes to federal IT

6 policy that have occurred since the LSN was originally

7 created.

8 Reconstituting the LSN in its original

9 form offers no significant advantage that Options 2

10 and 3 provide.

11 It does, however, offer significant non-

12 technical disadvantages in terms of cost, schedule and

13 IT policy.

14 And, here, we've included all of the

15 estimates of cost, time, risks and pros and cons to

16 get an overall score of the ranking. None of the

17 factors have been weighted.

18 In this chart, in general, the lower

19 numbers of the least costly, can be implemented the

20 fastest, have the least risks associated with the

21 solution and have more pros than cons.

22 You can see on the green line that

23 rebuilding the LSN is last in the ranking.

24 And, I will turn it over to Chip.

25 MR. CAMERON: Thank you very much, Margie.

1   And, I'm wondering, on this particular

2   option, since you've already identified perhaps or

3   anticipated some of the negative comments on it that

4   might come from people, maybe we should start off with

5   seeing if anybody sees some advantage to this option

6   that might keep the discussion shorter.

7   But, before we do that, we do have a

8   member of the LSS/LSN old guard who joined us on the

9   phone. And, you know, before anything happens to him,

10   I want to see if we --

11   (LAUGHTER)

12   MR. CAMERON: -- see if we could get him

13   on, it's Dennis Bechtel. Okay?

14   Are you going to unmute? Okay, hi,

15   Dennis.

16   (NO RESPONSE)

17   MR. CAMERON: Too late.

18   (LAUGHTER)

19   MR. CAMERON: Dennis?

20   (NO RESPONSE)

21   MR. CAMERON: So, we don't -- we can't

22   unmute Dennis?

23   (OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)

24   MR. CAMERON: Can he hear us? Can he hear

25   me?

1   (OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)

2   MR. CAMERON: Okay, Dennis, we're having

3   some trouble getting you in here on audio and it would

4   be nice to hear you. But, if you have a substantive

5   comment, you could type it in and we'll repeat it

6   here.

7   Okay, while we're trying to figure out

8   Dennis, and we'll try to get him on before we quit,

9   let's go to discussion of Option 4.

10   And, you don't have to follow my

11   suggestion about is there anything that would, quote,

12   recommend, unquote, Option 4?

13   And, we're going to go to Judy.

14   MS. TREICHEL: Well, at the risk of

15   sounding like a broken record, what could recommend

16   Option 4 might be some expert consultation about how

17   to set the thing up anyway.

18   And, if someone was to say, in order to

19   follow all guidelines that exist with various parties

20   including government, state, county, whatever, your

21   best bet is setting up a new system.

22   So, that's the only one I can think of

23   that would point you in this direction.

24   MR. CAMERON: Okay. And, let's discuss

25   the -- you raised the expert consultation. And, we do

1 have experts on the NRC LSA staff.

2   And, granted, and I think we've seen them

3 recognize that, that there are other things that they

4 need to explore with these options. Okay?

5   And, they could also help with providing

6 assistance to the AARP members.

7   (DOG BARKING IN BACKGROUND)

8   MR. CAMERON: Can we adjourn now?

9   (LAUGHTER)

10   MR. MCCULLUM: I think that should be the

11 last word on Option 4.

12   (LAUGHTER)

13   MR. CAMERON: Has Dennis been reincarnated

14 as a dog?

15   (LAUGHTER)

16   MR. CAMERON: But, okay, okay. I just say

17 thank you for that moment.

18   But, as I was saying, Judy, do you have --

19 are you saying that the NRC should hire some

20 independent experts to talk to the ARP? I just wanted

21 to clarify that.

22   MS. TREICHEL: I don't know how it

23 happened the first time around. We had people with

24 technical expertise. But, at that time, nobody knew

25 anything about a computer at all.

1   And, it's possible that you have people or

2   that there are people not associated with NRC in the

3   government who are experts on what the constraints

4   are, what the requirements are and so forth.

5   And, the state probably has people who

6   know that and other entities, whether it's counties,

7   tribes, industry, they may all have cybersecurity

8   stuff.

9   And so, if those people could be at one

10   place at one time, and this doesn't have to be a long

11   committee kind of a thing, just to inform the

12   participants of what their, you know, what their

13   advice would be.

14   MR. CAMERON: Does everybody get the gist

15   of what Judy is recommending? Because this should not

16   be lost in terms of what goes in the paper to the

17   Commission.

18   MR. GOLSHAN: I suppose what Judy is

19   asking, she wants to have a body of experts as

20   participants to go to and seek advice. Is that what

21   I'm hearing?

22   MS. TREICHEL: Yes, if somebody has the

23   expertise on the technical as well as the regulatory

24   issues, I would think it wouldn't be difficult for

25   them to be able to say, here's what you can do. And,

1   this is going to give you the things you need.

2   And, or here's two or three things and

3   this one costs the most and this one, whatever.

4   Because I'm not sure if people have to use

5   consultants or they have to contract out or if they're

6   able to do it or how it works.

7   MR. CAMERON: Okay. We'll have to give

8   some thought to that.

9   And --

10   MR. KLEVORICK: Chip?

11   MR. CAMERON: -- we've made progress.

12 We've definitely determined that that was Dennis's dog

13 so that we know that the audio is working. And, are

14 we going to hear from Dennis now?

15   Dennis?

16   (NO RESPONSE)

17   MR. KLEVORICK: Chip, Phil Klevorick here

18 for a moment, while you wait for Dennis.

19   MR. CAMERON: Okay.

20   MR. KLEVORICK: I'll get my Labrador to

21 call Dennis.

22   (LAUGHTER)

23   MR. KLEVORICK: Is this -- actually, just

24 to piggyback on a little bit on what Judy just said.

25   If there's a technical working group that

1 is established into defining going at some point

2 forward, I definitely would like to have immortalized

3 as discussion because I am not an IT person, I am not

4 sure if I will have an IT person and I don't know what

5 my IT peoples' capabilities are in the county.

6 As you guys know, I've had technical

7 difficulties and that was to deal with email. So, I

8 don't have a whole lot of confidence going forward.

9 That doesn't mean that I won't, but I think if we have

10 some way to make sure that that was immortalize on the

11 expert's opinion then I could -- whoever and however

12 and whenever this stuff materializes, then I can at

13 least say, here are the documents, I want you to

14 implement based on this.

15 MR. CAMERON: Okay. That's helpful. It

16 would be a technical working group comprised of NRC,

17 LSN experts and experts that --

18 (DOG BARKING IN BACKGROUND)

19 MR. KLEVORICK: Hi, Dennis.

20 MR. CAMERON: -- the parties might have.

21 And, I know Phil's dog's name is Rolex

22 Watch Dog, is that correct?

23 MR. KLEVORICK: It is Rolex, like as a

24 watch dog.

25 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Now, Dennis, Dennis,

1 do we have you?

2   (OFF RECORD COMMENTS)

3   MR. BECHTEL: Yes, I'll be right back.

4   (LAUGHTER)

5   MR. CAMERON: Okay, this is great comic

6 relief, but we do need to finish the rest --

7   MR. KLEVORICK: Who let the dogs out?

8   MR. CAMERON: -- of the meeting.

9   (OFF RECORD COMMENTS)

10 Okay, we're going to give Dennis one last chance,

11 unmute one last time and we're hoping we get Dennis.

12   (NO RESPONSE)

13   MR. CAMERON: Okay, well, let's move on

14 and maybe something will happen before the end of the

15 time.

16   Judy's reaction to Option 4 is okay, let's

17 have the technical working group look at it and see

18 what the advantages or disadvantages are.

19   Anybody else around the table want to say

20 anything about Option 4? Rod?

21   MR. MCCULLUM: Yes, I -- well, a technical

22 working group might have merits from a broader

23 perspective, particularly to the participants that

24 don't have a chief information officer sitting back

25 here.

1   I'm not sure I want that group to waste a

2 lot of time on Option 4. You know, what you're

3 talking about is spending the most amount of money as

4 the highest cost option to go the furthest back in

5 time.

6   And, let's not lose sight of one thing

7 that Margie said, which is that this would then have

8 to be in place until all licensing actions are

9 complete, that includes closure.

10   By my book, if we actually get this

11 project on a schedule again, that's probably a 100

12 years or more from now.

13   Now, we're here today because we paused

14 and technology advanced on us. I don't know that

15 anybody thinks the pace of technology is -- the

16 advance is going to slow down. I think we all kind of

17 hope that it will keep accelerating. It's fun, it's

18 making our world better.

19   So, the idea that, yes, the technical

20 working group might be helpful in sorting through the

21 other options, but to put any more effort into an

22 option that recreates something that's already become

23 a relic and puts it in place hoping it'll survive for

24 the long-term, I think we'll just be around the same

25 tables or maybe we'll have higher tech screens and

1 higher tech dog noises and faced with the same dilemma

2 again.

3   MR. CAMERON: Okay.

4   MR. MCCULLUM: So, yes, I vote no on

5 Option 5.

6   MR. CAMERON: All right.

7   Let me --

8   MS. JOHNSON: This is Abby Johnson.

9   MR. CAMERON: Abby, go ahead.

10   MS. JOHNSON: Hi, I don't have a dog, but

11 I hope you'll let me talk anyway.

12   MR. CAMERON: Well, I'm sorry, Abby.

13   MS. JOHNSON: Okay, should I hang up now?

14   MR. CAMERON: Just kidding.

15   MS. JOHNSON: So, I just wanted to make

16 two points. One is keeping in mind the usability for

17 a long period of time, whatever option is chosen,

18 needs to have a flexibility to be able potentially to

19 adapt it into the future with technology.

20   And, secondly, based on our past

21 experience with the options we're considering now,

22 simplicity to the extent that that's possible.

23   So, I would just like to put those two

24 principles forward onto the meeting notes. And, thank

25 you for listening.

1   MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you. Thank you,

2   Abby.

3   And, that would -- the two things that

4   Abby noted, which is flexibility to adapt to new

5   technology and simplicity, those would go in the mix

6   with what we were calling functional requirements or

7   attributes, things to consider.

8   So, thanks, Abby.

9   Is there anybody else on through

10   GoToMeeting that wants to talk to us?

11   We heard from Phil, Connie, Loreen,

12   Darrell? Anybody else want to say anything about

13   Option 4?

14   We're going to get you all on,

15   specifically when Andy Bates and not too long a time

16   is going to ask you just to give an expression of

17   interest, I think is the best way to phrase it about

18   the options.

19   But, we're going to go to you, but do you

20   have anything specific on Option 4?

21   MS. SIMKINS: This is Connie Simkins,

22   Lincoln County.

23   I like Judy Treichel's idea, but I'd like

24   to have it applied to all of the options because

25   Lincoln County doesn't have an IT capability today to

1   make these technical decisions.

2   I'd like to have a group tell me, this

3   will work or that won't work and this is what we

4   learned in the existing system.

5   MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks, Connie.

6   And, just to clarify, I think that Judy

7   was just trying to provide some help. She did suggest

8   that the technical working group would look at all the

9   options.

10   And, she was just saying, okay, they

11 should look at this one also.

12   But, thanks, Connie.

13   Anybody else?

14   (NO RESPONSE)

15   MR. CAMERON: Okay, let's go to the public

16 to anybody who's on through GoToWebinar, which would

17 include Dennis.

18   (NO RESPONSE)

19   MR. CAMERON: No one?

20   (NO RESPONSE)

21   MR. CAMERON: And, Ted, are you with us,

22 the operator?

23   OPERATOR: Yes, I'm standing by.

24   MR. CAMERON: Can you see if there's any

25 member of the public who's on the phone who wants to

1 | say anything to us?

2 | OPERATOR: Sure.

3 | And, again, if you ware on the phone and

4 | you would like to make a comment, please press star

5 | one and record your name. Thank you.

6 | I'm showing no comments at this time.

7 | MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you, Ted.

8 | Okay, we're done with Option 4 and before

9 | we go on, I just want to see, is there any other

10 | points? We've heard a lot about resource needs. And,

11 | does anybody in the room, first of all, in Rockville

12 | want to say anything more about the provision of

13 | resources to participate in this process?

14 | Anything that we have missed? Any finer

15 | points on that? Bob?

16 | MR. HALSTEAD: Well, I just add that, in

17 | addition to the limited, very limited carryover, carry

18 | forward previous fiscal year funding that the

19 | Commission has, which was about $400,000 before you

20 | got into this last run, we're not sure exactly what

21 | DOE is saying about their numbers, but we believe it's

22 | somewhere in the neighborhood of $10 million in

23 | unobligated plus some number, perhaps as much as $10

24 | million in obligated but unspent funds.

25 | So, the Commission doesn't really have

1 enough funding, it seems to me, to do much of anything

2 going forward on implementing what we say today.

3   It's up to DOE to decide, you know,

4 whether they would use their carry forward funds to

5 support these activities.

6   But, more importantly going forward, there

7 -- in terms of what the agencies have asked for, now

8 I've looked at the detailed NRC budget justification

9 for 2008, which we're in the middle of, and 2009 which

10 the final numbers just came out a couple weeks ago.

11   The Commission has not requested funding

12 for these activities. And, I think that's something

13 that the Commission needs to think about, at least in

14 this regard with the Advisory Review Panel as part of

15 the LSN reconstitution.

16   So, at some point I suppose someone will

17 be called to a budget hearing so they could talk about

18 it as a new request.

19   DOE has requested some funding in fiscal

20 2018. It went through the House, it was turned down

21 by the Senate Appropriations Committee, which has 31

22 members. And so, 15 Republicans and 15 Democrats, it

23 was not a partisan issue, voted for an appropriation

24 that had no money for DOE to go forward.

25   But, that is an area where both NRC, and

1   more limited, NRC is usually not been in the business

2   of providing funding except for very specific things,

3   like in this case, the operation of the Advisory

4   Panel.

5   But, that's certainly an area in the DOE

6   budget where it's appropriate to raise that question.

7   MR. CAMERON: Okay, that's helpful. It

8   could be good.

9   MR. MCCULLUM: Chip?

10   MR. CAMERON: Oh, go ahead, go ahead, Rod.

11   MR. MCCULLUM: Is there anybody in the

12 room on behalf of NRC who can clarify that point about

13 DOE's fiscal year 2019 funding request?

14   Because it's my recollection that --

15 obviously NRC's fiscal '19 funding request -- my

16 recollection that NRC actually requested $47 million.

17 And, I would think that would envelop these

18 activities.

19   But, if that's not true, I mean --

20   MR. CAMERON: Can we get some

21 clarification on whether --

22   PARTICIPANT: There's no detail about --

23   MR. CAMERON: -- NRC requested funds in

24 its FY '19 budget? The number $47 million was thrown

25 out, but --

1   MR. MCCULLUM: That's just my

2   recollection, but it --

3   MR. CAMERON: Does anybody --

4   MS. JANNEY: That did come out in the

5   press -- in a press release I think the day after the

6   White House released their fiscal year '19 budget.

7   You are correct.

8   MR. MCCULLUM: Okay, I would think if, and

9   again --

10   MR. HALSTEAD: This is what it looks like

11   guys. It's about a 100, maybe 200 pages long.

12   MR. CAMERON: Okay.

13   MR. HALSTEAD: The details are in there.

14   MR. CAMERON: Thank you. Thank you, Bob

15   and thanks for bringing that up.

16   MR. MCCULLUM: So, you know, I think

17   because the details aren't there, it's really up to

18   the agencies if Congress allocates DOE requested $120

19   million, NRC $47 million, I would hope that that

20   standing up the LSN would be among the first things

21   they would do. And, certainly, none of these numbers

22   would exceed those requests.

23   MR. CAMERON: Okay, that's useful and the

24   NRC LSN staff are noting this. So, okay.

25   Margie, did you want to say something on

1   this? No, okay.

2   Let me ask the -- is there anybody on

3   GoToMeeting that wants to say anything about the cost

4   issue?

5   We've heard from Phil and others. But, is

6   there anything else that you want to add?

7   MR. LACY: This is Darrell Lacy, and I

8   just support what they were talking about. And that,

9   until such time as we have funding, this is impossible

10   for us to set up additional servers and stuff like

11   that, just freeing up my time to participate in this

12   meeting is difficult.

13   So, if they fail us for the local

14   governments, and I assume the other ones are relying

15   on the future congressional funding decision to be

16   made before we can participate and do anything.

17   That said, even once we do get funding,

18   just based on the number of documents we have and, in

19   fact, most of the other local governments are going to

20   have less documents than we do, it doesn't make sense

21   for us to have any option that requires us to have our

22   own participant managed system, whether it's on the

23   cloud or in a server.

24   So, I think that at the very least for the

25   smaller parties, there needs to be an NRC managed

1   process at this stuff, it makes it easier for us.

2   Thanks.

3   MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks. Thanks,

4   Darrell.

5   Anyone else on the -- ARP members on

6   through GoToMeeting?

7   (NO RESPONSE)

8   MR. CAMERON: Okay, now we're going to do

9   the concluding segment and we're going to hear from

10   Margie, the Action LSN Administrator. We're going to

11   hear from Judge Bollwerk. And then, Andy is going to

12   take over and talk to you about options.

13   Margie?

14   MS. JANNEY: I'm going to quickly go over

15   the different options that we've heard about these

16   past two days.

17   Option 1 is traditional discovery.

18   Existing ADAMS LSN Library would be used to access

19   previously submitted documentary material.   New

20   material would be exchanged among the parties using

21   traditional paper discovery.

22   Option 2 is to leverage the existing

23   public ADAMS LSN Library. The existing ADAMS LSN

24   Library would be the starting point to access

25   previously submitted and any new documentary material

1   would be enhanced by additional requirements.

2   As you heard yesterday, the processes to

3   submit new material and to modify documents previously

4   submitted would be developed using the EIE or a semi-

5   manual process.

6   Option 3 is a cloud based system. The

7   content from the public ADAMS LSN Library would be

8   moved to a shared cloud based storage solution which

9   is NRC maintained in one alternative or high level

10   waste participate maintained in the other alternative.

11   Option 4 is to use the original LSN design

12   to rebuild a replacement.

13   Cost estimates are only for contract

14   dollars to develop an IT system. No federal employee

15   or participant costs for staff time and labor for

16   developing and maintaining any technical solution nor

17   for adding or maintaining documents was included.

18   For Option 2 and Option 3 alternative 1,

19   NRC staff as a participant costs are included, as I

20   discussed a little while ago.

21   Where it reads unknown on this table, the

22   word undetermined was used in the options paper, but

23   that word was too long to fit into this table.

24   No cost estimates were provided because

25   they were dependent on the size of the collection and

1   IT policy and procurement requirements for each

2   participant.

3   So, you can read the ranking there, 1

4   through 7 with two 5s, no 6.

5   Time estimate, again, no time estimates

6   were provided because they were dependent on the size

7   of the collection and IT policy and procurement

8   requirements for each participant.

9   You can also see the rankings there from

10   1 through 7.

11   Remember that the risk factors were

12   acquisition, technical complexity, technical

13   obsolescence, IT policy, technical expertise and

14   standardization.

15   There is no risk score for Option 1,

16   traditional discovery, because it doesn't require a

17   technical solution.

18   The numeric scores assigned to the system

19   benefit column is determined by subtracting the number

20   of cons from the number of pros for each solution.

21   The higher the number, the more pros and less cons.

22   You can also see the ranking there, 1

23   through 7 with two 4s.

24   And, here, we've included all of the

25   estimates of cost, time, risks and pros and cons to

1 get a raw score ranking. None of the factors have

2 been weighted.

3   In this chart, in general, the lower

4 numbers in the total column are for the options that

5 are the least costly, can be implemented the fastest,

6 have the least risks associated with the solution and

7 have more pros than cons.

8   Back to you, Chip.

9   MR. CAMERON: Okay, thanks, Margie.

10   I don't think I need to remind anybody of

11 your discussion through the last day and a half that

12 there's other costs and things that have to be added

13 into the risk factors in addition to the ones that the

14 NRC considered up to this point.

15   (OFF MICROPHONE COMMENTS)

16   MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you.

17   We're going to go to Judge Bollwerk.

18   MR. BOLLWERK: Thank you, Chip.

19   I'm not on the agenda, but I'm going to

20 kind of step in here for one second because there's a

21 couple things I wanted to say.

22   I introduced myself yesterday simply a

23 legal Administrative Judge, and that's true, that's

24 what I am.

25   Having said that, I was also the Chief

1 Administrative Judge when the LSN was put together.

2 That's sort to remind you of the specter of Dan Graser

3 who kind of hangs over and he -- Dan and Margie and

4 others work for me and put the system together back

5 then under my -- with me working on it.

6 And the sort of principles that I was

7 concerned about then, I'm concerned about now in terms

8 of what -- how this process goes forward.

9 And, I just want to say a couple things in

10 that light about, first of all, about the creation of

11 the LSN Library. And, I think K.G. described that

12 very well this morning in terms of why the -- how the

13 library was put together.

14 We've said consistently that it was not

15 created to be a discovery database, and that's true.

16 I would also say it was not created not to

17 be a discovery database. We did do anything that

18 would be inconsistent with creating it that way.

19 The reason for that is pretty obvious. We

20 weren't going to spend a million-plus dollars and put

21 that forward with something that later the IG would

22 come to us and say, you put this document -- this

23 database together. You knew you might have to do an

24 LSN which we knew we knew. Did you think about

25 whether that could be used?

1   And, the answer was no, of course we

2   didn't think about that. Of course, we were thinking

3   about it at the time, but that was not the purpose it

4   was put together for.

5   Having said that, it was not inconsistent

6   with that purpose. So, just so that's clear.

7   The other thing I would -- I just want to

8   mention is that I think you've heard from K.G. today

9   and others about it, Roy Choudhury, who was also

10   involved with creation of the LSN library, these folks

11   are experts.

12   They run the ADAMS system. It's a large

13   federal database, they are the people that do IT work

14   all the time.

15   So, to say -- I heard some suggesting that

16   maybe they don't -- they're not bringing expertise to

17   the table, they are. There are other experts out

18   there, to be sure, but please do not discount the fact

19   that they -- over my -- I've been dealing with them

20   now for four-plus years, five-plus years.

21   Just like Dan Graser knew what he was

22   talking about, these folks know what they're talking

23   about as well. So, again -- and they've tried to

24   under our -- working with SECY, we've tried to be fair

25   about this process and to present the best we could,

1   the options that you've heard today.

2   And, in terms of the options, again, when

3   given the direction we got from the Commission, having

4   one meeting, we felt we simply couldn't show up and

5   have first day talking about how we should do this and

6   the second day sort of grabbing ideas and the second

7   day sort of trying to sort those ideas out.

8   We felt we needed to put something on the

9   table for you all to consider. Maybe we've succeeded

10 in that and maybe we haven't, I don't know.

11   But, the -- I've heard some suggestions

12 maybe that the LSN library, the way we handled this

13 was sort of kind of stacking the deck. That wasn't

14 our intent. We simply wanted to have things out there

15 for you to consider.

16   As I said, it exists now, so unlike the

17 old LSN when we didn't -- it was not there to test.

18 It's there and it operates the way it does.

19   We've heard some suggestions about changes

20 to it. I hope -- I guess what I'm trying to say is,

21 other things with speed, there's some things that need

22 to need be changed. But, please give that system a

23 fair shake as you consider it.

24   Just like we need to give any other system

25 a fair shake, don't take the fact that we felt we

1 needed to bring it before you sort of fully blown in

2 one sense to -- as simply being something that doesn't

3 deserve consideration and it wasn't fairly and fully

4 put together in terms of what -- the way we tried to

5 put the system together.

6   So, just give the LSN library a fair

7 shake, I guess that's all I can ask of you, as you

8 should with any of these other options as you look at

9 them.

10   One other thing I just wanted to mention,

11 in terms of the next logical step, which is why we

12 actually have -- the Commission decided to have this

13 meeting called, everyone here has the same problem.

14 We're all looking at the question of no

15 infrastructure.

16   The ASLBP does not have an infrastructure.

17 We had a hearing room, we had the LSN which we put

18 together with the help and assistance with you all.

19   Everybody's concerned about staffing,

20 about infrastructure.

21   One of the reasons we want to get this

22 discussion started was, I would love to see a

23 congressional bill that says, you all have one year to

24 set up your infrastructure again and then the

25 proceeding will start. But, I haven't seen that yet

 1 | and I don't think we're going to see it.

 2 | So, we all need to just pay attention as

 3 | we go forward with this process and think about that.

 4 | What is the best way that we can get that

 5 | infrastructure in place to help everyone to do the

 6 | purpose which is basically the thing that's left is to

 7 | adjudicate the contentions that all of you have --

 8 | many of you have brought to the table.

 9 | That's the purpose that we're concerned

10 | about is the adjudication and the contentions.

11 | Because that's the main thing that's left.

12 | And, we want to put together a system that

13 | works for you all because that's the thing you need.

14 | You need to be able to do the discovery that you're

15 | going to need to do.

16 | And, in that respect, I should mention, I

17 | have a tremendous amount of respect for Judy Treichel,

18 | she's been here longer than I have doing this as a

19 | member. No, seriously, representing the interest of

20 | the public. And, that's something -- and I've heard

21 | about having this as a public database, and that is

22 | important, no question about that.

23 | But, please, don't lose as you go forward

24 | thinking about ways that you want to implement a

25 | search engine.

1   Because, in the end, it's things that

2 Martie and Laurie have got to be able to find what

3 they need.

4   And so, that needs to be something that

5 you keep forward in your mind.

6   I like Google, but we're not searching for

7 cat videos here, we're looking for document discovery.

8 The information that's in a 3.62692 million document

9 discovery database. And, that's what the focus needs

10 to be.

11   So, I hope as this -- to the degree this

12 goes forward, whatever recommendations or information

13 you want to provide to the Commission, you'll think

14 about that because, again, that's what you all need to

15 be thinking about. That's the next step here and

16 that's why we wanted to get this discussion started.

17   On behalf of certainly myself and the LSN

18 staff, I wanted to thank all of you for what you've

19 presented to us today. We can't thank you enough and

20 we hope you've at least found the information we

21 presented as well to be useful.

22   I'll take any comments if you want them.

23   MR. CAMERON: Okay, and I think maybe

24 we're ready to go to Andy. We're going to go to Andy

25 now who's going to ask each member if they have any

1   views -- further views they want to express on the

2   options.

3   I'm going to close out the meeting by

4   asking if there's anybody at the table or on through

5   GoToMeeting if they have any final words for us and if

6   there's anything that they want to say about what you

7   said, Paul, perhaps we'll capture it then.

8   But, Andy, you want to go ahead?

9   CHAIRMAN BATES: Yes, at this point, we've

10   spent a couple days talking, debating, getting all

11   kinds of great input, discussed the four options that

12   the LSN staff put forward, variations on it, concerns

13   people had.

14   I really want to go around the table now

15   and get the views of each one of the parties here,

16   representative members of the committee on what's been

17   presented and offer up what your views are, whether

18   you -- on either each of the options, what a preferred

19   option might be, options that basically don't fly,

20   that you don't think are viable and work our way

21   around the table and then go to each of the members

22   who are on GoToMeeting.

23   So, Jessica, I'll turn to you first.

24   MS. BIELECKI: Sure. Well, thank you for

25   the discussion and, Judge Bollwerk, those comments

1   were very helpful, thank you.

2   I think as we've talked about, there's

3   been a lot of unknowns with a number of the options.

4   So, it's hard to give any conclusive, you know, views

5   at this point.

6   But, generally, Option 1, I think, from

7   the staff's view could be potentially burdensome,

8   depending on the number of documents we have, again,

9   that's a bit of an unknown.

10   Anything that would be more automated,

11   such as Options 2 and potentially Option 3, I think

12   would be an interest to us just for feasibility and

13   day to day operations when we get into the

14   adjudication.

15   But, again, as we talked about Option 3,

16   there's a lot of unknowns and a lot of things that

17   still need to be fleshed out. So, it's hard to make

18   the comparison.

19   And, like we were talking about earlier

20   today, Option 4, going backwards it seems a little bit

21   reconstituting the LSN.

22   So, that's kind of where we are now.

23   CHAIRMAN BATES: Okay, thank you.

24   Tom?

25   MR. POINDEXTER: As you all can tell,

1   we've been in listening mode for the last day and a

2   half, haven't said too much. And, that was on purpose

3   because we wanted to hear everyone speak their mind

4   without any potential polarization of comments from

5   the Department.

6   But, listening to everyone, which all of

7   your comments are helpful and valuable to the

8   Department. If you're going to force, Andy, to I

9   guess pick one, I think we would lean more towards

10   Option 2.

11   Not to discount any of the others, each

12   has merit, but all things considered, and a great job

13   by the NRC to pull up these options. That's the

14   direction we would go.

15   CHAIRMAN BATES: Okay, great, thank you.

16   Judy?

17   MS. TREICHEL: I think I've just about

18   said everything I have to say. Thank you.

19   CHAIRMAN BATES: All right, thanks.

20   Bob?

21   MR. HALSTEAD: Yes, I want to briefly

22   split our comment between Laurie and Martie and

23   myself, so Laurie will start.

24   CHAIRMAN BATES: Okay.

25   MS. BORSKI: First of all, I want to say

1 how much we very much we appreciate your having us

2 here and listening to us. And, I appreciate that the

3 concerns that we laid out, both in the functional

4 requirements and on the problems encountered, have

5 been taken seriously. Some have even been solved or

6 resolved before we even go here.

7   And, I just want to reiterate that I'm

8 just one paralegal of many and there are all the

9 counties, all the other participants may have the way

10 that they need to search the LSN and it's probably

11 different than what I do. So, we very much need their

12 input as well.

13   Thank you.

14   MR. MALSCH: I should begin by first

15 repeating what Laurie said. I think the discussion

16 here today has been very helpful. And, I think we

17 appreciate all the effort that's going into preparing

18 for this meeting and preparing some of the background

19 papers and so forth.

20   When we began, Nevada said that it really

21 wanted to follow the process that had been followed

22 originally, which was more than one, several meetings

23 of the Advisory Committee, the formation of a

24 technical working group followed by Notice of Comment

25 rulemaking.

1   And, I just wanted to say that I think the

2   discussion here today has reinforced our belief that

3   that's the way to proceed.

4   If you go through the options, Option 1 is

5   traditional discovery for new documents.   And, I

6   wanted to mention that new documents are really

7   documents that were generated or became available

8   after August 2011, so this is not new documents, 2018

9   going forward. There are a lot of old documents that

10   would be considered new documents in this category.

11   Because, in August 2011, the participants'

12   obligation to update their collections was suspended.

13   So, new documents are documents after August 2011.

14   That's a fairly substantial collection of documents.

15   Traditional discovery would be for new

16   documents and would use the ADAMS LSN under Option 1,

17   perhaps as improved, hopefully is improved, for the

18   old documents.

19   Option 2 is the ADAMS LSN for old and new,

20   hopefully improved.

21   Option 3, some kind of a cloud system.

22   Option 4, rebuild the old LSN.

23   The difficulty we have here is that Option

24   1 may be a complete non-starter, depending upon the

25   number of documents that would be new documents that

1 would need to be made available. A number was thrown

2 around of 10,000, 15,000 more documents.

3 If there's some uncertainty as to what

4 that number is, but that's important to know because

5 if the number is substantially greater than 10,000 or

6 15,000 documents, then traditional discovery for new

7 documents is just a non-starter.

8 Option 2, the question would be, can it be

9 improved and how much can it be improved?

10 Option 3 is a cloud system, but a major

11 problem for evaluating that so far is that we had lots

12 of discussion about searching mechanisms and searching

13 infrastructures and software in connection with

14 traditional ADAMS, we don't even know what they are

15 for cloud systems. So, they're -- as they stand,

16 they're difficult, impossible to evaluate.

17 Option 4 may be a non-starter because of

18 OMB policy -- so IT policy.

19 So, it seems to me that, going forward

20 from here, we have a number of options that are moot

21 perhaps because the staff is going to a cloud

22 technology anyway. Other options may not at all be

23 viable either because of government IT policy or the

24 number of documents involved and others are not

25 sufficiently defined to really make any kind of a

1 | recommendation.

2 | So, it seems to me, going forward, what we

3 | need is some additional expertise and some experts to

4 | look at these options and look at maybe other options,

5 | particularly suboptions under a new cloud system, so

6 | that we can even define what the options are.

7 | It seems to me at this point in time we

8 | don't even know what the options are.

9 | And so, that's why I think I wanted to

10 | repeat the Nevada recommendation that, going forward,

11 | we should set up a technical working group to both

12 | further define the options that have been put on the

13 | table and perhaps develop -- hopefully develop some

14 | other new options.

15 | But, that I have to say that the formation

16 | of such a technical working group was probably -- it's

17 | just not going to happen unless there's additional

18 | funding.

19 | So, I think, without additional funding,

20 | there's not a whole lot of progress we can make here.

21 | MR. HALSTEAD: I know we need to hear from

22 | other people. I just want to make a concluding remark

23 | about, again, how much we appreciate the work that the

24 | NRC LSN staff put into the preparation and carrying

25 | out of this meeting.

1   I want to thank Chairman Bates and the

2   facilitator Chip. And, I want to thank Judge Bollwerk

3   and all the people that are here.

4   I was very skeptical two months ago about

5   how much effort we should put into interfacing with

6   your effort. And, I think you've really advanced our

7   knowledge of what needs to be done here.

8   It's not a failure that we're not at a

9   point where we can confidently give you a vote of

10 confidence in a particular option. I think what we've

11 learned here in particular is that we're going to need

12 more information on the time and cost aspects of the

13 Option 2 and Option 3 suboptions.

14   I don't think you hear much interest from

15 us in developing Options 1 and 4. So, as a screening

16 exercise, I think that, in and of itself, is a

17 success.

18   But I -- we've tried to help you identify

19 the things that we believe have to be in the system.

20   And, the final comment I want to say, I

21 appreciate all the people that are around the table

22 from the Advisory Review Panel and the people that are

23 on the line virtually and we say again, we think the

24 Advisory Review Panel needs to be the prime mover in

25 going forward in reconstituting the LSN.

1   And, we deeply appreciate all the work

2   that you've put into this and the manner in which you

3   have handled the meeting.

4   Thank you very much.

5   CHAIRMAN BATES: Thank you.

6   Rod?

7   MR. MCCULLUM: Yes, I want to just

8   summarize by building on something Judge Bollwerk said

9   a short time ago which is that the goal of this

10   exercise was to put something on the table for us to

11   consider.

12   In that regard, I consider this meeting to

13   be a significant success. I look at the range of

14   options that have been provided here.   That is a

15   sufficiently wide range.

16   I think the ranking summary you brought in

17   was an excellent start. I think the discussion that

18   we've had would cause that to advance. You're already

19   in the rank summary, I think, see some separation.

20   I want to agree with the way Martie Malsch

21   broke down the options in that, you know, you've got

22   a 1 and 4 that I think are non-starters.

23   Option 3, I think that will come to become

24   a non-starter if we really put a lot of effort into

25   evaluating the licensee costs and the risks associated

1 | with the various alternatives in Option 3.

2 | So, I would, you know, concur and, as

3 | Martie said, there are questions on Option 2, you

4 | know, can we make it work? I think we can.

5 | I think, you know, we came into this

6 | meeting representing Option 2, alternative 1 because

7 | of a lot of reasons. We it as -- we do see it as

8 | workable and it is the only option on here that is of

9 | absolutely no cost to us.

10 | We can provide documents through the

11 | electronic information exchange. And, we have

12 | confidence in that.

13 | I can't speak for the other parties, but

14 | to the extent that the burden on the parties,

15 | certainly, traditional discovery is a tremendous

16 | burden on all the parties.

17 | I would hope that would be similar. So,

18 | I think, while there are things that the NRC can do to

19 | help enable the participants, you know, we've talked

20 | about technical working groups and further things.

21 | And, I do think we do need to recognize the

22 | considerable expertise NRC has already brought to bear

23 | and does have on this.

24 | So, you know, yes, we participants might

25 | need some help at some point, but I think what you got

1 out of this meeting is a pretty solid basis to move

2 forward.

3   And then, there's an option we can move

4 forward on those gaps that need to be closed. You

5 know, we heard about some of those issues.

6   But, there is a basis for moving forward.

7 Obviously, we can't move forward until Congress weighs

8 in on our funding here. But, I would encourage the

9 NRC, should you be funded to do so, to move forward on

10 Option 2, alternative 1.

11   And, that's our conclusion.

12   CHAIRMAN BATES: Okay, great, thank you.

13   At this point, I think I've got everybody

14 in the room who represents members of the panel.

15   I'd like to go to GoToMeeting and let me

16 start, Rex Massey from Churchill County, are you

17 online with us?

18   (NO RESPONSE)

19   CHAIRMAN BATES: Rex, are you there?

20   (NO RESPONSE)

21   CHAIRMAN BATES: Well, let me go on and

22 maybe touch Loreen Pitchford who -- with Lander County

23 and I guess also Churchill County. Are you there?

24   MS. PITCHFORD: Yes, I am.

25   I felt that the alternatives, all of them

1　　have time constraints as well as cost. And, of

2　　course, I think further consideration needs to be

3　　done.

4　　　　　　　　And, I also concur with Martie, that

5　　Option 1 and 4 are likely non-starters.

6　　　　　　　　Moving forward, I think it's difficult for

7　　the county, where we have no funding and I know that's

8　　been brought up.

9　　　　　　　　And, I also want to thank all of you for

10　　the presentation, all the work you've done on these

11　　option papers. I think it's a lot more to consider,

12　　but it's, you know, it's a great -- it's great right

13　　now the way it's going forward.

14　　　　　　　　So, I look forward making more comments

15　　after all of the -- I believe that we're going to

16　　receive something from the NRC around March 9th that

17　　kind of summarizes a lot of this. And, we can make

18　　comments -- further comments at that point.

19　　　　　　　　Thank you.

20　　　　　　　　CHAIRMAN BATES: Thank you.

21　　　　　　　　Is Darrell Lacy there still from Inyo

22　　County? Darrell?

23　　　　　　　　MR. LACY: Yes, I'm here.

24　　　　　　　　I think we're really consistent with most

25　　of the other people. And, please don't tell anyone I

126

1   agree with Nevada.

2   But, unfortunately, it's something that we

3   have funding to move forward. I think we agree that

4   Options 1 and 4 are non-starters. We just don't think

5   they can do what we need to do.

6   The issues brought up as far as using

7   ADAMS as your baseline for your three-plus million

8   documents, I think that's the correct approach.

9   However, the State of Nevada brought up some very

10   specific issues for functionality that need to be

11   addressed. And, I think something to be fixed.

12   That said, from our perspective, we don't

13   really care whether you maintain your own servers or

14   whether you use the cloud. So, Option 2 or 3 to us is

15   pretty much transparent we think.

16   But, from our county's perspective, we

17   would probably be okay submitting new documents

18   through the electronic interface information exchange.

19   But, I think the options for the smaller

20   players to just submit material annually needs to be

21   allowed at least for the smaller player.

22   So, I think that's our path forward that

23   we have reservations on.

24   CHAIRMAN BATES: Great, thank you.

25   Phil? Phil Klevorick, Clark County?

1   MR. KLEVORICK: Thank you, Andy.

2   First of all, what I'm going to do is I'm

3   going thank the NRC staff and Judge Bollwerk for their

4   efforts in getting all this together.

5   I know that it's a necessary path, so I

6   appreciate -- I really do appreciate you guys taking

7   the time and trying to get us all together trying to

8   figure out what's going to work for all of us.

9   I'm going to start out with my IT issue on

10   my phone. So, as the -- as some people on this call

11   or whatever you want to call it, basically, you've

12   been aware that I've had IT issues within the county

13   regarding email.

14   And, I was making the comment earlier

15   today about my phones being dropped all the time and

16   mysteriously over the last two and a half hours, I get

17   a Type B notification basically saying that we're all

18   certainly have network issues within the county

19   including phones and computers.

20   So, it's an important issue on my end, but

21   I do want to make the point that these things do

22   happen. And, it seems to be have been more dropped in

23   Clark County, but I'm sure it happens elsewhere, too.

24   So, we -- somehow when we were doing these

25   webinars, it could be important to try to be aware of

1 some of these issues basically if they come up whether

2 they're owned by the county or whomever. Just keep

3 that in mind.

4 Regarding Martie Malsch's statement, I 100

5 percent, minus maybe 1 percent, agree with everything

6 he provided as far as types of data and technical

7 review of the four options. And, I appreciate him

8 summarizing all that as he did.

9 Because I am not an IT person. I depend

10 on other people and they're not doing a very good job

11 now.

12 But, a few things I do want to bring up,

13 oh, and Rod McCullum's comment on the ranking summary,

14 well done, Rod. Because I do believe the ranking

15 summary is one way to try to balance the understanding

16 of what the benefits of each one of those things and

17 they do agree that they probably would have to be

18 rebalanced and reestablished or recomprised after the

19 comment period over the last couple of days.

20 So, I think that ranking summary may

21 change a little bit, that doesn't mean that they're

22 going to -- one's going to outshine the other but I do

23 believe that they need to be adjusted that would

24 include cost to the operators and things like that.

25 No doubt that whatever system gets chosen,

1 revitalizing an archaic system such that the LSN and

2 it becomes more archaic by the day, because we don't

3 know when this new system would be implements, whether

4 it's six months or three years from now or five years

5 from now, it only goes further and further in the

6 archaic system. So, I'm not sure why Option 4 would

7 even be on there.

8 It seems to me, I get that it's been owned

9 and established, but it seems like there's probably

10 better options going forward.

11 And, the last thing I want to be doing in

12 three or five years or two years from now is to keep

13 reiterating it is an old system that doesn't meet the

14 current needs or whatever like that.

15 That doesn't mean that we couldn't, but it

16 just seems like there's probably going to be newer

17 options.

18 And, finally, you know, whatever process

19 is brought in there, Martie, like I said, articulated

20 very well the IT technical issues, but I think there's

21 there human factor that also needs to be addressed

22 when it comes to understanding all of this stuff.

23 And, we've -- most of the ALPs are

24 businesses. I'll just reiterate on our behalf and

25 other people, is understanding that capabilities of

1 resources of smaller entities involved including the

2 tribes are going to be extremely slower probably than

3 other larger entities who have capabilities of finding

4 expertise sooner and capabilities a lot.

5 So, I just caution, but I appreciate that

6 the NRC understands that when they go to make a

7 determination on what's going to happen that they

8 understand that there's going to be some kind of a

9 slowness factor on a lot of us just because of our

10 capabilities and lack of information and resources.

11 And, thank you for the time, Andy.

12 CHAIRMAN BATES: Okay, thank you, Phil.

13 I see Ian Zabarte's got his hand up. I

14 haven't overlooked you, Ian, but go ahead.

15 MR. ZABARTE: Good morning.

16 I've been involved in this project for

17 about 32 years, since 1986 and I've seen a lot,

18 experienced a lot. And, as we move into this new

19 effort, we're coming -- that is the Native Community

20 Action Council, which is the only unfunded part of the

21 proceedings, we are indigenous. We are Western

22 Shoshone.

23 And, the problem is, we already have a

24 letter from the NRC staff telling us that there will

25 be no funding to Native Americans, that funding will

1 come through the Department of Energy to the affected

2 Indian tribes which is essentially a U.S. federal

3 protectorate.

4   The chairman that was overthrown by the

5 Bureau of Indian Affairs and the 9th Circuit Court

6 then said they're not going to interfere.

7   So, that's how we're treated when we

8 participate and do work that's meaningful to us.

9   As I said, we already received a letter.

10 I received the letter that says that they'll ask DOE

11 -- NRC will ask the Department of Energy if they'll

12 make some type of funding available, potentially

13 consultation and coordination funds.

14   And, other members of this Advisory Review

15 Panel would include the National Council of American

16 Indians. They're not stakeholders, they're not

17 communicating with us, neither is the other federally

18 recognized tribes that the NRC and DOE would

19 collaborate with.

20   And, herein is the problem, we've been

21 prejudiced coming into this. We've been prejudiced at

22 this time with no funding.

23   And so, we want, again, I just want to

24 clarify, the way that we see this is that DOE, NRC,

25 EPA and even the Bureau of Land Management, as U.S.

1 agencies are indistinguishable and completely

2 responsible for the actions that they fund through

3 those federal protectorates, the American Indian

4 Subwriters group and all those documents and we

5 believe this process if that's (telephonic

6 interference).

7   CHAIRMAN BATES: All right, thank you.

8   Let me now turn Heather Westra -- okay,

9 you're no longer on the phone meeting. So, Prairie

10 Island is offline.

11   Byron Pyle, White Pine County?

12   (NO RESPONSE)

13   CHAIRMAN BATES: Byron, are you there?

14   (NO RESPONSE)

15   CHAIRMAN BATES: Let me skip over Byron

16 then.

17   Connie Simkins from Lincoln County, are

18 you on?

19   MS. SIMKINS: Yes, I'm on.

20   CHAIRMAN BATES: Connie, any views or

21 comments here, please?

22   MS. SIMKINS: I agree a little bit with

23 everybody that's spoken, if that isn't mixed up, huh?

24   I feel like Option 2 will best serve

25 Lincoln County. I also would like to see a component

1 | of Option 1, the traditional methods because there are

2 | folks out here that don't have the technical knowledge

3 | to do otherwise.

4 | And, I thank you for setting up this

5 | confab because I have learned a lot and Lincoln County

6 | will continue to be an eager student as this process

7 | goes forward.

8 | Thank you.

9 | CHAIRMAN BATES: Thank you.

10 | Greg James from Inyo County, are you on?

11 | MR. JAMES: Yes, this is Greg James.

12 | CHAIRMAN BATES: Can you provide us with

13 | any of your comments, views, consensus, sense of

14 | feeling?

15 | MR. JAMES: Sure, thank you very much for

16 | convening this meeting and for providing your options.

17 | As far as the County of Inyo's concerned,

18 | I think we agree with the comments of the State of

19 | Nevada and with Abby Johnson who indicated whatever

20 | happens, it should be fairly simple so that the rural

21 | counties can participate without a huge amount of

22 | expense.

23 | And, if there's going to be a working

24 | group, we would look forward to participating in that

25 | going forward.

1   Thank you.

2   CHAIRMAN BATES: Thank you.

3   Is Abby Johnson online? I think you're

4   connected.

5   MS. JOHNSON: Yes, this is Abby Johnson.

6   CHAIRMAN BATES: Go ahead any comments?

7   MS. JOHNSON: Eureka County, can you hear

8   me?

9   CHAIRMAN BATES: Yes.

10   MS. JOHNSON: Yes, Eureka County will be

11   submitting written comments after the transcript come

12   out.

13   But, I think the last point that Phil

14   Klevorick made about always considering the unlevel

15   playing field for digital access is really important.

16   And, just, again, if there is going to be

17   a new way to do this, something that has simplicity as

18   one of the bedrock principles so that, you know, so

19   that we don't complicate making a peanut butter

20   sandwich.

21   So, we're going to provide our comments in

22   writing and we appreciate this opportunity to think

23   about this again and it's been very helpful to hear

24   the explanations of the options.

25   Thank you.

1   CHAIRMAN BATES: Okay, thank you, Abby.

2   Let me go back and double check, is Rex

3   Massey online, connected at all? Rex?

4   (NO RESPONSE)

5   CHAIRMAN BATES: And let me revisit Byron

6   Pyle, are you there?

7   (NO RESPONSE)

8   CHAIRMAN BATES: Okay, and I think we've

9   hit everybody on the list that I've got here.

10   I really appreciate the participation of

11   everybody here. I think it's been a great two days of

12   discussion.

13   I really want to thank Andy Welkie and

14   Lisa Bamford and our technical crew and staff that has

15   helped maintain all the contact. This is in summary,

16   to say, first time venture for the NRC to have this

17   many people on GoToMeeting, GoToWebinar or audio

18   connections. I think it's been a learning experience

19   for all of us working through this.

20   Paul, Margie, K.G., Tom, Rekha, all of the

21   NRC LSN staff that have put this together I think

22   really have done a great job. Annette and all the

23   crew, we've spent clearly a fair amount of time

24   thinking about this during the fall and trying to put

25   this together in a way that would work for everybody.

1   And, it's been very productive couple of

2 days and I think, you know, we've now got to go back

3 and digest all of your comments.

4   As we indicated earlier, the transcript

5 will be back to us probably the beginning to middle of

6 next week and we hopefully get it up online by next

7 week on Friday and we'll send out an email with

8 probably a link to access it. Given probably the

9 length of it, we're not going to put it in the email

10 itself or attach it, but we'll give you a link to it.

11   And, we'll ask for feedback in two weeks

12 which would take us, assuming we get it up by next

13 Friday, about the 23rd of March.

14   MR. CAMERON: Okay, thank you.

15   I just wanted to make sure, I think we

16 heard any final comments. But, if anybody does have

17 anything final, please off it.

18   And, I feel like I should check in with

19 Dennis Bechtel again.

20   (LAUGHTER)

21   (NO RESPONSE)

22   (DOG BARKS)

23   (LAUGHTER)

24   MR. CAMERON: Okay, well, that's perfect.

25   But, I think Paul wants -- do you want to

1 say anything in terms -- there were some people that

2 Andy didn't mention.

3   MR. BOLLWERK: I mean, I think Andy got

4 the highlights in. I can't say enough about the work

5 with Andy Welkie and Joe Daiker who sort of put

6 together the IT along with Lisa, who's been here on a

7 daily basis. Sarah Culler, who's back there kind of

8 helping out as well. Rekha Nambiar who has been our

9 trainer, you all have seen her a lot, probably more

10 than anybody else here.

11   But, I hope, better or worse, you know

12 what the LSN library does and doesn't do at this point

13 anyway.

14   So, Tom Wellock who's sort of the voice of

15 the LSN library now, if you get a chance, go through

16 the videos, you'll get to hear Tom.

17   I mentioned K.G. and Roy, who again, are

18 the folks that run ADAMS and that's what they've been

19 helping us with.

20   I appreciate Margie Janney stepping in as

21 the Acting LSN Administrator. I know she's glad to

22 follow in Dan's footsteps. And, I mentioned the fact

23 that with the specter of Dan, I'm going to say Dan's

24 ghost, because Dan is alive and well. He's doing

25 well, so he still hangs around whenever you mention

1 the LSN.

2   (LAUGHTER)

3   MR. BOLLWERK: And, oh, I should mention

4 Annette. Annette is actually -- if you think this was

5 an organized meeting, it's because of Annette. She's

6 been the one that has kept the train on the track and

7 running for two, three, four months now.

8   And, to the degree any of us were getting

9 off on the sidebars, she was the one that brought us

10 back. And so, her organizational skills, that's what

11 SECY does, they do meetings and this one -- this was

12 a good meeting, you can thank Annette because she was

13 the one that sort of organized it and put it together.

14   Thank you, Andy.

15   MR. CAMERON: Russ Chazell and Brian,

16 Newell --

17   MR. BOLLWERK: Russ Chazell, is that him

18 sitting back there?

19   MR. CAMERON: He's our --

20   MR. BOLLWERK: He's been also -- and Brian

21 Newell, we don't want to forget Brian. You all talked

22 to Brian probably several times. He's the voice of

23 the LSN to this point.

24   But, Russ has been sort of there with

25 Brian, the two of them working together, to keep this

1 organized as well. All part of SECY which, as I said,

2 is the organizational people.

3 We have Andy Bates back which was good as

4 was our LSN ARP chairman before.

5 And, how could we do one of these without

6 Chip? I hope we don't ever have to find that out.

7 That would be bad news for me.

8 MR. CAMERON: Well, I know when there's a

9 dog on the phone.

10 (LAUGHTER)

11 MR. BOLLWERK: But, again, on behalf of

12 the LSN staff, I want to thank all of you for your

13 participation and your input into the process.

14 As was mentioned, we'll get this -- the

15 transcript out next and get the -- and give you an

16 opportunity to make comments.

17 We'll get the transcript, we're not going

18 to have you sending any summaries at this point, it

19 will just be the transcript. So, that's the based on

20 what you can provide us whatever else you want us to

21 hear, I think it's by the 23rd of March approximately.

22 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

23 And, did you want to clarify, we heard

24 from, I don't know if it was Loreen, someone mention

25 a March 9th date? I don't know what --

1   (SIMULTANEOUS SPEAKING)

2   CHAIRMAN BATES: I think March 9th is when

3   we anticipate the transcript will be available.

4   MR. BOLLWERK: March 9th is basically when

5   we hope to have the email out. It may be earlier than

6   that --

7   MR. CAMERON: Okay.

8   MR. BOLLWERK: -- if we can get the

9   transcript, then we'll get it posted by then. But,

10   March 9th is sort of our drop dead date to get the

11   email out to all of you all and let you know that it's

12   out there.

13   If you want to, you're certainly welcome

14   to go in the LSN library and check every day to see if

15   it's there. But, we'll send you a transcript -- we'll

16   send you an email to let you know so you don't have to

17   necessarily do that.

18   And, feel free, again, to hit the LSN

19   library. It's there for your use. It's all those

20   3.692 million documents. They're there, we did the

21   best we could to get them back out and made them

22   available to the public and we hope to the degree you

23   find them. You don't need them, they're there for

24   your use.

25   So, thank you very much.

1   MR. CAMERON: And, just we tried to get

2   everybody in, but in terms of thank you from NRC, LSN

3   staff Joe, I don't know if we thanked Joe, but

4   especially Lisa, Lisa Bamford has been involved

5   throughout this. And, we heard enough about mom,

6   that's my new term for Annette, and Sarah, thank you.

7   And, I think we got everybody. But, Andy,

8   do you want to close us out?

9   CHAIRMAN BATES: I think with that, unless

10   somebody else has got another comment, we'll adjourn

11   the meeting.

12   Thank you all.

13   (Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went

14   off the record at 1:14 p.m.)

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25