

**EIS-US NUCLEAR REGULATORY COM**

**Moderator: Carla Roque-Cruz**

**June 28, 2021**

**12:00 pm CT**

Coordinator: And thank you for standing by. At this time, all participants are in a listen-only mode until the question-and-answer session of today's conference. At that time, you may press star 1 on your phone to ask a question. I would like to inform all parties that today's conference is being recorded. If you have any objections, you may disconnect at this time. I would now like to turn the conference over to your host, Mr. Lance Rakovan. Thank you. You made begin.

Lance Rakovan: Thank you, (Vanessa). Hello, everyone. My name is Lance Rakovan. I'm a Project Manager at the US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, or NRC. And it's my pleasure to facilitate today's meeting. We're going to try to do our best to make today's meeting worthwhile for everyone, and we hope that you'll help us out with that.

The purpose of our meeting today is to get feedback on the NRC Fiscal Years 2022 to 2026 high-level draft Strategic Plan and Strategic Plan Appendix A, External Key Factors, as well as an annotated outline of the Evidence Building Plan.

This is a comment gathering meeting by NRC's definition, meaning the purpose of this meeting is for NRC Staff to meet directly with individuals to receive comments on specific NRC decisions and actions to ensure that NRC Staff understands their views and concerns.

We'll be going over the agenda for the meeting soon. But first, I wanted to go over some ground rules and do some introductions.

We are using Microsoft Teams for this meeting, along with the telephone bridge line. We have a lot of information that we'd like to share with you before we open the floor to questions and comments. So we'll have everyone on mute until we get to that portion of the meeting. At that point, I'll step in and go over how you can provide your questions and comments. But in the meantime, the Teams' chat feature will be open.

Also, before I do introductions, I'd like to remind folks that you can email comments as opposed to sharing them during this meeting or in addition to sharing them at this meeting to [strategicplan@nrc.gov](mailto:strategicplan@nrc.gov). Again, that's [strategicplan@nrc.gov](mailto:strategicplan@nrc.gov). And we'll go over that a few times today.

So to do a few quick introductions of our speakers. Catherine Haney is the Assistant for Operations in the Office of the Executive Director for Operations. Ms. Haney joined the NRC in 1981 as a Health Physics Intern in the former Office of Inspection and Enforcement. After a break from federal service, she rejoined the NRC in 1989 and served in a number of positions in the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

Since joining the Senior Executive Service in 2001, she has served in a number of senior management positions, including Chief of the Safety and

Safeguards Support Branch; Deputy Director, Division of Nuclear Security, Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response; Program Director of Policy and Rulemaking; Deputy Director, Division of Licensing Project Management; Director, Division of Operating Reactor Licensing; Deputy Director of the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards; and Regional Administrator of NRC Region 2.

She received a bachelor's degree in radiological technology from the University of Maryland and a master's degree in radiological science from Emory University.

Carla Roque-Cruz is currently an Executive Technical Assistant in OEDO with responsibilities in the area of strategic planning. Previous, she has worked as a Quality Vendor Inspector in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation; and Storage and Transportation Inspector in our Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards; and a Reactor Inspector in NRC Region 3 office.

She completed the NRC Aspiring Leader Certificate Program in 2015. Carla received her B.S. degree in mechanical engineering from the University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez Campus.

Finally, Matthew Meyer is currently an ETA in the Office of the Executive Director for Operations, again with responsibilities in strategic planning and implementation of the Evidence Act. Previous to this position, he worked in the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards as a Technical Assistant and as a Hydrologist for the majority of his career.

He has a bachelor's in science and Earth science from Northwestern University in Chicago, Illinois, and a Graduate Certificate in Geotechnics, yes, from Missouri Science and Technology in Rolla, Missouri.

So with that, I'd like to turn things over to Cathy with some opening remarks. Again, we'll get into a few presentations, and eventually, I'll be back so we can get your comments and questions. Cathy.

Catherine Haney: Thanks, Lance. And welcome, everyone. It's very nice to see all of you here. As Lance said, I am the Assistant for Operations in our Office of the Executive Director for Operations. And the work on the Strategic Plan is - falls under my area of responsibility. So I'm very happy that you've joined us today to give us some comments. We really are looking forward to your feedback on our high-level draft Strategic Plan, which is covering the period of 2022 through 2026, and then the annotated outline of the evidence-building.

Okay, sorry for the pause right now. I think we need to get the slides. Right, Matt.

Well, I'm going to go ahead with the welcome. They - so the input that we receive from you today is very much going to help us as we move forward with finalizing these documents. And the Evidence Building Plan is something new for us this year. We did not have that as part of the Strategic Plan last year.

Some of you were probably on a call that we had a few months ago, back in September, when we were starting our work in this area. We very much appreciated your comments. They very much helped us inform what we moved forward with.

So I'll just give you a little bit of an insight, a teaser, I guess I'll call it, is the high-level plan and the Strategic Plan that we're talking about today differs a little bit from what you've seen before. We've added two new goals, one in the area of fostering organizational health and promoting stakeholder confidence.

So these, obviously, are in addition to the current goal that we have, which is regulating the nation's civilian use of radioactive material to provide reasonable assurance of adequate protection. So it's just those two new ones that we'll be looking for - well, we'll be looking for comments on all of them, but we'll definitely want your input on those two items.

So as we continue to work on these documents, it's very important that we do get feedback from our stakeholders, and that's both internal and external stakeholders. So, again, thank you for joining us today.

So during the meeting, we'll be discussing the annotated outline of the building plan. (Unintelligible) referred to as the Learning Agenda. So sometimes you'll hear those used synonymously. And the Evidence Building Plan is a systematic approach for identifying and addressing priority questions that are relative to the agency's programs, policies, and regulations. And it's a coordination tool that allows us to engage stakeholders in evidence, planning, and building to help achieve the agency mission. And it's one of the documents that you will - supports our agency Strategic Plan. And this is in accordance with the - what we refer to as the Evidence Act.

So again very brief overview, just again a plug there, we definitely are seeking your input as we move forward in this particular area.

So next slide, which hopefully would be the agenda, just a couple quick things. One, you've made it through opening remarks and we'll be shortly through the discussion on the agenda. The first thing that we're going to touch on is the high-level draft Strategic Plan. And there will touch on the goals and objectives that I gave you just a little bit of brief oversight into. Then we'll look at the annotated outline of the Evidence Building Plan. And then we'll go into the open discussion where we hope we hear from you and get lots of comments and then we'll move to close.

So with that, I'm going to turn things over to Carla.

Carla Roque-Cruz: Good afternoon, everyone, and thank you so much for joining us today. I have to apologize in advance. If you hear a dog, the door is closed. They're downstairs, but, you know, sometimes they can get loud. So if you hear a doggie, you don't mind that. My name is Carla Roque-Cruz. And I am going to start off with a brief overview of a Strategic Plan.

But before I get into my slides, I would like to briefly provide some background on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The NRC is an independent agency that was established by the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 and began operations in 1975. Congress established the NRC to regulate the nation's civilian, commercial, industrial, academic, and medical uses of nuclear materials.

The NRC's scope of responsibility includes the regulation of commercial nuclear power plants, research and test reactors, nuclear fuel cycle facilities, medical, academic, and industrial uses of radioactive material, the decommissioning of these facilities and sites, and transport, storage and disposal of radioactive materials and waste.

When it comes to the Strategic Plan, the Government Performance and Results Act - Modernization Act of 2010 aligns strategic planning with the beginning of each new term of an Administration requiring every federal agency to produce a new Strategic Plan by the first Monday in February, following the year in which the term of the President commences. The Strategic Plan provides the blueprint to plan, implement, and monitor the work needed to achieve our mission. It establishes the long-term strategic goals and objectives the agency aims to achieve, identifies actions the agency will take to realize those goals, and provides a basis for the agency budget and performance plan.

The Strategic Plan should not be a binding document that prevents agencies from learning from experiences and adapting their plans to changing circumstances. Instead, the strategic goals and objectives can be updated over time and should incorporate agency learning and emergent or external factors that may impact the agency. Agencies need to translate the long-term goals in their Strategic Plans to strategic objectives and then to performance goals. These, in turn, should be supported by other indicators used to monitor and interpret progress.

The annual performance planning, human capital planning, and budget processes jointly support the agency's implementation of the strategic goals and objectives by establishing resources, allocation, refine strategies, activities, indicators, targets, and milestones in more detail. The agency's Strategic Plan provides the framework for all their plans and reports where agency performance goals and related analysis are communicated, monitored, and revised when needed.

Slide 5, please. Now, what have we done so far? Throughout the development of the Strategic Plan, the NRC conducts outreach with both internal and

external stakeholders. The NRC believes that nuclear regulation should be conducted as openly and as possible, and the public must be informed about and have a reasonable opportunity to participate meaningfully in the NRC's regulatory processes.

In September of 2020, we conducted a Public Meeting and issued a Federal Register Notice to receive feedback on our current Strategic Plan that goes from 2018 to 2022. The feedback we received helped to develop that high-level draft Strategic Plan that included Appendix A to the Strategic Plan, which is Key External Factors, and the annotated outline of the Evidence Building Plan, also known as the Learning Agenda. This is one of the documents that will support the federal agency's Strategic Plans going forward as required by the Evidence Act.

Slide 6, please. So now what are our goals?

The high-level draft Strategic Plan includes goals on fostering organizational health and promoting stakeholder confidence. These are in addition to the goals linked to the agency's safety and security mission. Regulating the nation's civilian use of radioactive material to provide reasonable assurance of adequate protection of public health and safety remains our utmost priority. This first goal is a combination of the two goals we had in previous NRC Strategic Plans, which were, ensure the safe use of radioactive material and ensure the secure use of radioactive material.

The NRC accomplishes these goals through day-to-day activities such as reviewing, issuing, and renewing power reactor licenses (development), overseeing the safety and security of power reactor facilities, including the spent fuel, and licensing and regulating nonpower uses of radioactive material, such as industrial and medical applications of radionuclide.



For this goal, a successful outcome is one in which the civilian use of radioactive materials within the United States is carried out in a manner that protects the health and safety of the public and the environment and promotes common defense and security.

The objectives for these goals are related to the quality of our licensing and oversight activities, our regulatory requirements, and the emergency preparedness and response capabilities for NRC and NRC licensed facilities.

Slide 7, please. Now, one of our two new goals is a goal in the area of fostering organizational health. In expanding the Strategic Plan to incorporate these areas of focus, this framework will serve the agency better over the next four years by providing a clear roadmap that can be utilized in budget development and as part of the agency's response to the guidance in Office of Management and Budget, OMB, Circular A-11, and the requirements of the Foundations for Evidence-based Policy Making Act of 2018, which is the Evidence Act.

Organizational health is necessary to foster the agency's ability to carry out its mission. A healthy organization provides the capacity and capability to enhance the agency's culture, organizational learning, business practices, and strategic management to prepare for an evolving future. Continual improvement enables the NRC to enhance stewardship of resources, technology, and the workforce to improve performance in achieving our mission.

A successful outcome of this goal results in an organization and infrastructure that facilitates continuous learning and innovation, knowledge management,

diversity and inclusion, technology adoption, and strategic planning, which in turn inspires our workforce.

For this goal, the objectives touch upon our desired organizational culture and workforce, and the use of modern technology, innovation, and knowledge management to support data-driven decisions.

Slide 8, please. The draft goal number three is focused on inspiring stakeholder confidence in the NRC. To be successful, the NRC must not only excel in carrying out its mission but must do so in a manner that inspires confidence. The NRC strives to promote transparency in its regulatory activities, provide opportunities for candid and meaningful public participation, and demonstrate that the agency is a capable, independent, trustworthy, and objective regulator.

Confidence in the NRC and engagement from stakeholders is enhanced when the agency consistently carries out its mission in an effective, timely, disciplined, and open manner. To achieve this goal, the NRC must review as an independent, open, and reliable regulator. This will be accomplished by providing stakeholders with clear and accurate information about and a meaningful role in its regulatory process.

The two objectives of this goal focus on NRC's engagement of stakeholders in an effective and transparent manner, the use of high-quality data and information in the NRC decision-making process, and the availability and accessibility of NRC information.

Slide 9, please. What are our future steps?

So the Office of Management and Budget, Circular A-11, contains the timeline for agencies to develop and obtain input from OMB throughout the Fiscal Years 2022-2026 Strategic Plan Development Process. This meeting right now is part of the development process. Your feedback will inform this full draft Strategic Plan and its attachment. This draft is due to OMB for their review on September 2021. Once we receive comments from OMB, we will incorporate the Commission and OMB's comments into the final draft of the Strategic Plan and its attachment. The final draft is due to OMB for clearance on December 2021.

Once we receive clearance from OMB, then we can go ahead and finalize the steps to publish the Strategic Plan on February 2022.

Now, I will turn the presentation over to Matthew Meyer, who will start - who will be starting with Slide 10.

Matthew Meyer: Good afternoon. And thank you so much for joining us today. Thanks, Carla, for the introduction. So my name is Matthew Meyer. And today I will be presenting on the NRC's Evidence Building Plan, which is also known as that Learning Agenda.

Slide 11, please. So what is the Evidence Building Plan?

The Evidence Building Plan will now be included in the Strategic Plan and is a new requirement of the Evidence Act. The Evidence Act describes the Evidence Building Plan as a systematic plan for identifying and addressing priority questions relevant to the programs, operations, policies, and regulations of an agency. And priority questions are developed by engaging with internal and external stakeholders, as well as assessing the agency's needs to develop evidence for decision-makers. More broadly, it is a

coordination tool to engage stakeholders in evidence, planning, and building to help achieve an agency's mission. The Evidence Building Plan is intended to emphasize and foster an agency culture of learning and continuous improvement.

Slide 12, please. The annotated outline of the Evidence Building Plan. Included in the high-level draft Strategic Plan includes nine questions that align with the draft strategic goals that Carla previously described. The priority questions include areas such as assessing whether the licensing and oversight can be improved based on lessons learned from the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency, evaluating the NRC's strategic workforce planning processes, and evaluating the extent the NRC's programs, policies, and activities are addressing environmental justice.

I will go over each of the nine priority questions in a little more detail.

Slide 13, please. The first priority question is certainly on the forefront of many organizations as we look back on the last 15 months. The first question reads is how can the NRC improve licensing and oversight based on recent operational experience, including lessons learned from the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency? Gathering lessons learned and incorporating best practices from recent licensing and oversight activities could help NRC Staff focus on those activities most important to safety.

In response to the challenges of the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency, the NRC quickly identified temporary alternative and risk-informed methods for conducting licensing and oversight activities while continuing to provide reasonable assurance of adequate protection of public health and safety.

To answer this priority question, the NRC will identify lessons learned and collectively document temporary changes made to the NRC licensing and oversight processes in response to the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency. The NRC will further analyze these and other lessons learned to determine potential benefits and improvements to the NRC's licensing oversight process. The NRC Staff plans to begin this assessment in Fiscal Year 2022.

Slide 14, please. Next question is in regards to what stakeholder data would be most beneficial for use in advanced analytical tools such as machine learning and artificial intelligence in order to support the NRC decision-making?

The NRC receives information from stakeholders in various formats through mandatory and voluntary information collections. The information is used in agency activities to support the safety and security mission. The NRC relies heavily on individual employee analysis for reviewing items such as licensee submittals, licensing basis documents, reporting requirements, and rulemaking activities. By improving how the NRC collects data and information, advanced analytical tools can be used and have the potential to make decision-making easier, faster, and more efficient.

Receiving data and information in formats that readily allow analysis through modeling or calculations allows for a more effective use of resources for both the NRC and licensees. These data improvements will also be beneficial to members of the general public, as well as universities performing academic research in the areas identified. The NRC Staff plans to begin this assessment beginning in Fiscal Year 2023.

Slide 15, please. Next question is in regards to what to extent are the NRC's computer codes capable of supporting independent analysis of the safety of advanced reactor designs and operations?

And really, the NRC routinely uses scientific computer codes and analytical tools to perform confirmatory, sensitivity, and uncertainty analysis to independently analyze the safety of advanced reactor designs. These codes and tools help examine safety margins inherent in the design commensurate with the risk and safety significance of the phenomena applicable to specific reactor designs. The NRC will perform analysis and research to identify the reactor systems analysis, computer codes, analytical tools, information, and data that the staff may need in evaluating the safety of non-light water reactor designs. Also to assess the existing capability of computer codes, analytical tools, and supporting information.

The assessment will also identify gaps in both analytical capabilities and supporting information and data. It'll also interact with both domestic and international organizations working on non-light water reactor technologies to enhance collaboration and cooperation. The NRC Staff will begin this assessment in Fiscal Year 2022.

Slide 16, please. Next question involves around to what extent are licensing actions performed by the NRC becoming more or less resource-intensive over time? And have there been any changes in work product quality?

High-quality license reviews are essential to ensuring the NRC is accomplishing its mission. Answering this priority question will help to ensure NRC licensing reviews are high-quality, use a risk-informed approach, and use an appropriate level of resources.

The NRC will assess licensing actions associated with the generic milestone schedules required by the Nuclear Energy Innovation and Modernization Act. The assessment will determine if similar licensing actions have become more or less resource-intensive over time. Also, identify resource variances between similar licensing actions, identify the factors contributing to the increase and decrease and variance of resources for each type of licensing action. Also, to determine if there were any changes to the quality of the work products due to those variances.

The NRC will engage internal stakeholders to conduct this assessment. Really, this assessment will provide a better understanding of how resources are being used for similar licensing actions and may provide key insights to further risk inform the agency's licensing process. The NRC Staff will begin this evaluation in Fiscal Year 2023.

Next slide, please. This question really revolves around the NRC's workforce and is to what extent our NRC's workforce planning processes adequately accommodating potential workload fluctuations?

The goal of strategic workforce planning is to formulate strategies and action plans that enable the NRC to recruit, retain, and develop the workforce required to address emerging needs and workload fluctuations. The SWP process supports agency efforts to better forecast the amount and type of work now and in the future direction of the agency's work and empower staff to plan for their professional career development. The NRC will perform an evaluation that assesses the effectiveness and efficiency of the current strategic workforce planning process.

And will compare estimated workloads and staffing projections against actual results. The NRC will engage with internal stakeholders using the strategic

workforce planning process and benchmark against other federal agencies. And this evaluation will also begin in Fiscal Year 2023.

Slide 18, please. This question involves the NRC's processes and how can we improve them. And it reads as what process improvements can be implemented to make the NRC a more moderate risk-informed regulator? And how are those - how are they aligned with performance indicators?

The policies and procedures are vital to ensure consistency, clear expectations, performance measurement, and establish roles and responsibilities for agency. The NRC operates with structured policies and procedures such as management directives and office instructions. The NRC uses a Performance Management Framework that clearly and directly links program goals with the NRC Strategic Plan and institutionalizes the use of performance information in decision-making. These policies and procedures and the NRC's Performance Management Framework will move the agency toward being a more modern risk-informed regulator.

Consistent with the Fiscal Year 2022 Annual Evaluation Plan, the NRC will identify and prioritize agency policies based on the level of potential improvement or benefit to the agency measured by frequency of use and level of effort while factoring in potential risks. Also, use mission analytics to identify agency-wide process gaps that could be improved or benefit from procedure development, as well as evaluating the processes or identify gaps and using a process evaluation based on the priority ranking and make improvements that result in effectiveness and efficiency while managing any added risk.

Given the need for alignment between the agency's policies and procedures and its performance management, the NRC will also analyze the agency's



performance indicators to determine if they provide meaningful outcomes, provide a structure that allows for consistent reporting, or should be discontinued or modified or replaced with new performance indicators that provide more meaningful results. The NRC Staff will begin this assessment in Fiscal Year '22, and it will span all the way through 2024.

Slide 19, please. The next slide is really on the NRC better - helping the NRC better leverage research conducted through NRC-sponsored university research and development grants.

The NRC's University Nuclear Leadership Program awards funding to universities for research and development grants. The program is intended to develop a workforce capable of supporting the design, construction, operation, and regulation of nuclear facilities, and the safe handling of nuclear materials. The NRC will perform an evaluation of the University Nuclear Leadership Program to identify opportunities to leverage university grants to support NRC research needs.

The evaluation will include activities such as internal and external stakeholder engagement, process reviews, and benchmarking with other federal agencies. Ideally, the evaluation will reveal strategies for more effective use of research funding in the future. The NRC Staff will begin this assessment in Fiscal Year 2024.

Slide 20, please. Next priority question involves how can the NRC improve external engagement and to inspire stakeholder confidence?

The NRC takes an active role in the open government initiative by ensuring that the public is informed about and has a responsible, or reasonable opportunity to meaningfully participate in the NRC's regulatory process. The

NRC will assess the agency's current practices for external engagement to determine the effectiveness of these methods and to establish a baseline for stakeholder confidence. The assessment will include reviewing readily available information such as the Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey and Safety Culture and Climate Survey results, public comments for rulemaking and policy statements, participation in Public Meetings, engagement in social media platforms, and inquiries received through our public web page.

The NRC will conduct an analysis and identify areas for improvement and develop recommendations to inspire stakeholder confidence in areas where it is lacking. And this will begin in Fiscal Year 2022.

Slide 21, please. This is our last question which it'll read to what extent are the programs, policies, and activities addressing environmental justice?

The NRC will perform a systematic review of how the agency's programs, policies, and activities address environmental justice. As part of this review, the staff will evaluate recent Executive Orders and assess whether environmental justice is appropriately considered and addressed in the agency's programs, policies, and activities such as adjudicatory procedures and environmental reviews given the agency's mission. The NRC will benchmark practices of other federal agents - federal, state, and tribal agencies and evaluate whether the NRC should incorporate environmental justice beyond implementation through the National Environmental Protection Policy Act.

The NRC will review the adequacy of its 2004 Policy Statement on the treatment of environmental justice matters and NRC regulatory and licensing actions. The NRC Staff will also consider whether establishing formal

mechanisms to gather external stakeholder input would benefit any future environmental justice efforts.

The NRC will also engage with internal and external stakeholders representing a broad range of perspectives to solicit their views.

And the NRC Staff has already begun working on this priority question. That will continue into Fiscal Year 2022.

Please be aware that over the next few months the NRC Staff will be holding a number of Public Meetings to engage with stakeholders to inform the systematic review for this priority question.

With that, I'd like to hand things back over to Lance Rakovan, our meeting facilitator, to begin our open discussion segments.

Lance Rakovan: Great, thanks, Matt. So we have some questions. Matt, can you please mute? Thanks.

Okay. So we have some questions that we would like to use just to kind of help facilitate discussion, kind of get just thinking. These are not intended to be comprehensive by any means. But I'll go through them. And we'll leave them up as we open things up for discussion. And I'll go through them really quick.

First one is how can the NRC better share its progress towards the draft goals and objectives in a way that is meaningful to you?

Are there any important factors the NRC should consider when developing answers for the priority questions?

What information or data would be beneficial to include in the Strategic Plan?

What actions can the NRC take to continue building stakeholder confidence?

What contributing activities should be considered to support the draft goals and objectives?

And how can the NRC better communicate using modern technology, for example, social media and crowdsourcing?

So for those who are using Teams, you can use the chat feature to send in a question or comment electronically. We already have one that I'm going to get to momentarily. Or you can also use that to say that you would like some time at the mic and we'll unmute your mic. You should also be able to raise your hand if you can use that feature.

(Vanessa), can you let us know if we have anyone on the phone lines at this time? Because there wasn't earlier, I believe.

Coordinator: Thank you. We will now begin the question and answer session. If you would like to ask a question, please press star 1, unmute your phone, and record your name. Your name is required to introduce your question. If you need to withdraw your question, press star 2. Again to ask a question, please press star 1. It will take a few moments for the questions to come through. Thank you.

Lance Rakovan: Okay. So while we're doing that, I see we do have one hand. But I'm going to get to the question from John Butler. Let me back up to Slide 17.

Matt, this is a question for you. The priority one question appears to be limited to recent operational experience. How far back will this analysis go? There is a value in broadening this period prior to COVID-19. Do I have the right one up there, Matt?

Matthew Meyer: You have to go back a little further, Lance, from the licensing actions. It should be the first. Keep going. Next slide. No, other way. Next one. There you go.

So, yes, the extent of this question, we're going to go back and it would vary for different types of licensing actions. But we want to be able to provide some historical data, five to ten years in the past. This is going to be limited by our ability to link past systems together that the NRC has used for tracking this information.

But the purpose and the goal here is to provide as much historical information as we can to provide that, you know, better dive into, you know, what the past efforts have included.

So I don't have a definitive answer for you, John. But the goal is to provide historic information as best as possible to ensure that we have an adequate assessment and analysis.

Lance Rakovan: Okay. Doug True, it looks like you have your hand up. You should be able to unmute yourself.

Doug True: I do. Thank you very much and thanks for the opportunity to participate today. This is an important topic to the industry and I think it's great that you guys are giving us a chance to interact today.

As we talk about this Strategic Plan and the industry looked at it back in the fall, it became really clear that the next 5 to 7 years are probably the most critical time period in the US nuclear power industry in the last 40 years.

With the nation making important decisions on how to reduce carbon emissions and the Biden Administration and Congress both signaling an important role of the current fleet and future SMRs and advanced reactors will play in that US strategy and the current fleet under financial stress, which you did note as an external factor, this Strategic Plan provides a really important tool to accelerate the journey that the NRC is already on to become a modern risk-informed regulator to support those needs of the nation.

Another thing that struck us as we looked at it was that that's a lot different than the last time that the NRC went through this process. A lot has changed in the industry. The current fleet has gone through a lot of change. In addition to some units being prematurely shut down, the whole fleet faces significant financial pressures.

And we've taken many steps to modernize how we do business and streamline the way that we do business to make things more efficient and effective while attaining some of the highest safety performance ever. And according to INPO and (Oneok) the best in the world.

In addition, the other thing that's changed is the fact that the world has now recognized that decarbonization is no longer an option. It's something that the nation must pursue.

And NRC - so NRC now is working in a fundamentally different environment and any - different than any time in its - since its creation.

And in light of that, in November, the industry submitted two significant letters to the NRC, one signed by the CNOs from utilities and major suppliers and one signed by CEOs of major advanced reactor developers.

And those letters were unprecedented in the fact that they were individually signed and reflect the emphasis that the industry believes is needed in this strategic plan and its implementation as we go forward.

Atomic Energy Act calls for nuclear energy to be made to be - to make the maximum contribution to the general welfare of the United States. And these words have never been more important in light of the climate challenge that we're facing. And the letters made three points that the industry felt needs to be addressed in this Strategic Plan.

The first was that the Strategic Plan should continue the drive to become a modern risk-informed regulator the NRC has been striving to become and to drive that transformation as rapidly as possible. By being more risk-informed, plants get safer and by - and the resources are used more efficiently. By being modern, it allows the NRC to adapt to the changing environment that both the current fleet and the future fleet will be operating in.

Second point was that elimination of unnecessary burden and pursuit of efficiency and expediting the licensing of safe new designs need to be a priority. And those are consistent with the principles of good regulation that the NRC operates with.

And in order to accomplish this, the third point that the letters made was that this Strategic Plan needs to be continuously reinforced. It can't really be a plan that's done once every four years and put it on the shelf. It needs to be put

into action where there's follow-up and adjustment and continuing to strive to meet those.

And I'm glad to see or at least I took from some of your slides that it does appear you're tying this into your performance management system in order to drive those behaviors going forward. And I imagine in the open question section we'll get into that some more.

We also provided some other detailed comments in response to the Federal Register Notice. I imagine there'll be some questions about where those comments get dispositioned or if there is a disposition of them.

But to close, our nation needs a nuclear regulatory that steps up to this moment. And the NRC is actually really well-positioned to take the needed steps with the work that the staff has done to date.

And this - we think this Strategic Plan can be an excellent tool to drive the agency to get alignment and to meet this moment to sustain the progress towards our nation's goal.

And we're here today, a number of us from a task force that was formed by the CNOs, to focus on this subject. And we're here to support and interact with the NRC Staff on this. And we're very interested in learning about additional opportunities we may have to influence some details of this plan as it, or provide input on the detail of this plan as you move beyond the high-level plan and then to the more detailed Strategic Plan.

And with that, I think I'll finish my opening remarks. And then you can follow up if you'd like to ask me questions about things I said, or we can move onto other questions.



Lance Rakovan: All right, Cathy, Carla, Matt, either - any of you have questions that you wanted to ask about Mr. True's statement?

Matthew Meyer: I'll pass to Catherine.

Catherine Haney: Lance, it's Cathy.

Lance Rakovan: Sure.

Catherine Haney: Yes. Not right now. I think let's - I might in a little bit, but not right now.

Lance Rakovan: Okay, sounds good. With that, I do have one more hand that I'd like to go to. And then I'll check in with you, (Vanessa). Caroline Cochran, if you can - should be able to unmute yourself.

Caroline Cochran: Hello. Yes, this is Caroline Cochran. I'm the co-founder of Oklo, Inc. I want to briefly share just a couple quick insights that we've seen as the only, I guess, current license application under review, but also over our work, formal, you know, work with the NRC since 2016.

I wanted to mostly, hopefully, give some encouraging words. I think we've seen some really amazing performance by the NRC Staff in face of a global pandemic. And I'll just elaborate really quickly.

You know, we submitted our application March 11th of 2020, and literally flew back to California that was in lockdown, and people in DC were doing the same thing not long after. So to your point in the plan about utilizing technology, I think we've seen a maybe remarkable rate of adoption of using, you know, remote meetings and so forth, just in the weeks immediately after

that when we were honestly anticipating a review that would probably involve a lot of intensive onsite visits. So I would give a shout-out on that.

And also, you know, encourage the continued application of technology. We've been working with our Project Manager about further insights as far as billing and so forth and use of technology there. I'd say we've probably seen where there could probably be further improvements as far as tools regarding project management to enable NRC Staff. That's just an insight that I think we've seen over our review time now just over a year.

I think also just as far as culture, over the years we've seen pretty incredible innovation from the staff. I think we've been impressed by the work of Embark. But also just our core team and even having a core team approach. I remember that being proposed to us back in probably 2017 or 2018 and thinking that was a good thing. And it has continued to be a good thing, I think, having a core team that are familiar with an application rather than essentially matrix has been good.

Watching the transformation efforts as well. And just encouragement to continue enabling staff to think innovatively. I think if there's a culture that kind of slaps wrists for sticking your neck out and trying new things, I think, you know, that won't be the culture that you want to have. And that would enable all of the values that NRC holds as their core values.

To the point of inspiring confidence, I'd say, you know, to be really frank, probably there's been both steps forward and backward there. In any case, there's been many challenges, of course, facing the agency. Echoing what Doug True just said. You know, where, you know, the agency is being pressured, needs to learn to license many different technologies, different fuel types, different coolants, different size ranges, dramatically different size

ranges, developing a Part 53 and congressional pressure there, as well as overseeing a fleet, existing fleet that is somewhat rapidly waning.

So we can certainly see that there are steps forward and backward there. But that's where it's going to be increasingly important. That particular bullet point is inspiring confidence of stakeholders is going to be crucial to even having an industry in the future.

And my last point would be, I think from our point of view, we'd encourage utilization of the lessons learned from the new scaled designed certification. I think Doug brought up several points there. But as well as the industry letters. And as well, not neglecting early findings and insight from the Oklo license review. I think we've learned a lot.

And I think the staff that has been working with us have learned a lot over this past year, you know, certainly. And I expect to move that forward. That, I guess, would be my final kind of encouragement of insights to utilize as the agency moves forward. Thank you for the time to comment.

Lance Rakovan: Thank you. I do have a couple other hands. But I just want to check-in quick with (Vanessa). (Vanessa), do we have anyone on the phone line that wanted to ask a question or make a comment?

Coordinator: We show no questions or comments at this time.

Lance Rakovan: Okay very good. Thank you. Let's go ahead. John Butler, if you could go ahead. You should be able to unmute yourself if you'd like to have the floor.

John Butler: Hi. Can you hear me?

Lance Rakovan: We can, please.

John Butler: Great. I appreciate the opportunity provided by this meeting to start some discussion on the Strategic Plan. I am interested in learning more about the process going forward. It was mentioned in the slide material that a draft is going to OMB in September. All we've seen thus far is the high-level draft. Will there be an opportunity to review and comment on the full draft?

Matthew Meyer: So the high-level draft really provides that framework that Carla was mentioning to move forward. The process going forward after this becomes very time-sensitive and making sure that we have the final product ready for Fiscal Year '22 in February.

And so they're really just expanding. And it doesn't incorporate a lot of changes from this because the draft goals as we move them forward will be pretty fundamental as we expand it.

And a lot of the elements that are in our current Strategic Plan will be folded into our full draft and that'll eventually make it into the final.

So what you're seeing in this high-level draft is really is the bulk of the changes or additions. So I really encourage you to provide comments on this full draft - the full - the high-level draft. The full draft is not scheduled to be publicly available until the final is available in February 2022.

John Butler: So the draft that goes to OMB, will that be made public?

Matthew Meyer: It is just for interagency comments with OMB to be able to provide the final that we will have in February of 2022. Correct.

John Butler: One of the items in the current Strategic Plan that is very informative and gives at least me a good idea of what the Strategic Plan is trying to achieve is the contributing activities. The high-level draft that we've seen doesn't have those contributing activities.

So not having an opportunity to review and possibly comment on those contributing activities is a pretty significant limitation in my view.

Matthew Meyer: Well, we can definitely take that into consideration, John. And as we go forward to expand that public interaction, we can take a look at that also, sir.

John Butler: I would appreciate if you could. Not having an opportunity to review and comment on something broader than the high-level summary, I think, is pretty significant and would be one of my major comments on what we've seen thus far.

If I could continue, as Doug mentioned, we put a lot of time and effort in back in the fall of last year and providing some - our thoughts on how the Strategic Plan should be going forward.

And will there be anything put out publicly that identifies how our comments were addressed or resolved?

Matthew Meyer: Again, we could take a look at that and provide you with feedback. I don't think they are publicly available as of right now. But I will take a look at that after this meeting.

John Butler: All right. I'll probably have additional questions. But I will release for somebody else to ask questions.

Lance Rakovan: Very good. Looks like our next hand is from Jason Zorn. Jason, you should be able to unmute yourself. Jason, are you with us?

Jason Zorn: I'm here. Can you hear me, Lance?

Lance Rakovan: Yes. We can hear you.

Jason Zorn: Sorry, I had some button difficulties.

Lance Rakovan: Okay.

Jason Zorn: Thanks, Lance. My name is Jason Zorn. I'm Assistant General Counsel with Exelon. A couple - I have a few questions and I might start with one and then come back to it after other folks have had an opportunity.

But this is on goal three, which as you noted, is an entirely new goal in the Strategic Plan. And, you know, we haven't had a huge amount of time to process this since these drafts were only published a couple of weeks ago, to understand this goal and what it might mean or how it interplays with the mission statement, etcetera.

Obviously, have the public having confidence in the NRC is extremely important, you know, both from the NRC's perspective, the public's perspective, and the industry's perspective.

I guess my question, though, is relates to how does this - what is the interplay with this goal and the agency's mission statement, which is largely or is entirely driven really by the Atomic Energy Act, and since the NRC is a technical regulator, you know, which is focused on scientific decisions?

But what - you know, there's a little bit of concern, I guess, for me is, you know, to what extent does this suggest that, you know, there's a - they might be regulating not towards what the scientific standard is, but more to sort of what public perception of the issue is.

And so just hopefully, somebody can kind of explain, you know, what the thinking is behind this goal and how it might, you know, interplay with the mission statement. You know, an example would be, if the NRC reaches a conclusion that, you know, a certain decision is based on, you know, based on safety standards, based on engineering and science, yet the public is not convinced that that is correct. You've therefore not met your goal in goal number three, but maybe you've met your goal in number one.

So what would be the outcome in that situation?

Matthew Meyer: So 100% correct that, you know, our safety mission and our security mission is very important. This is not trying to detract from that. We're not trying to - you know, we are an independent regulatory agency. So we must be able to provide that independence as well as to communicate to our stakeholders of the actions that the NRC is taking.

So this stakeholder confidence is really trying to drive at ensuring that the members of the public, that the stakeholders that are involved are aware of the decisions being made by the NRC as well as their availability to provide comments, just as if we're doing today.

So it's more of that stakeholder confidence in the regard of how NRC interacts with the public to ensure that we have meaningful participation rather than just receiving feedback that drives a different decision. Our decisions are independent and we're not trying to change that process in any way or any

regard. It's just making sure that we have our comments heard from the public and we are able to address and provide an understanding of what we do and how we're making our decisions.

Do you have anything to add, Cathy?

Catherine Haney: No, nothing to add. I mean, just really, I guess what I'll just reinforce, you know, we need to have our decisions based in, you know, the sound technical nature of the decision.

So and, of course, with the stakeholder confidence that, you know, we are - and stakeholders are, you know, the public, the industry are all - so we do look for - we'll have to balance it, but at the same time, not at the sacrifice of the technical information.

And I'll just use this as an opportunity to do a little bit of a plug for something that a survey that we should be sending out in the early fall. And that's I think many of you are familiar with the fact that NRC has been working or has a transformation effort underway where we've been looking to go towards the risk informing our activities. As mentioned, I think, Caroline, you mentioned that, with a focus on doing that. Also, our people, use of technology.

And we have a set of objective and key results that we've been working towards. And one of those key results has us going out and engaging our external stakeholders and asking questions about how we moved forward in the area of transformation and innovation over the last year.

And some of the items that - there's an overlap between what I'm hearing and these conversations as well as in that survey. So like I said, it was a bit of a



shameless plug. When it does come out, we look forward to all of you contributing to that survey.

Back to you, Lance.

Lance Rakovan: We're full of shameless plugs. That's okay.

Catherine Haney: Okay, thank you.

Jason Zorn: Lance. Lance, this is Jason again. I'm sorry. Thank you, Cathy, for that. That's - we'll look forward to that survey later.

This is - I had a second question. But it's related to the first, which is, you know, a lot of the information under goal three seems to be sort of overlap or consistent with the principles of good regulation.

And but the principles of good regulation are not expressly mentioned in the goal. I was wondering if we could get some perspectives on how the staff sees goal - those two areas kind of aligning with one another.

Catherine Haney: I think, Jason, so I'll jump in. I think there is some overlap. And again, that'll be one of the things that we're considering as we further develop these particular areas. And it's also a good note for us to take from this meeting to make sure that we do establish that relationship or at least address it in our documentation.

Jason Zorn: Thank you, Cathy.

Lance Rakovan: All right, I'm going to do a quick check-in with (Vanessa). Anyone on the phone line?

Coordinator: We show no questions or comments at this time.

Lance Rakovan: Very good. Okay, Mr. Butler, it looks like you have your hand up again.

John Butler: Yes. Thanks. I've got a couple questions here. Let me start with a quick question. The comment period for, well, the period since the materials for this meeting were released and now was pretty short. I think that materials were released last week. So it's a fairly short turnaround time to, I guess, develop any thoughts or comments on that.

So can I presume or can you confirm that if we have any follow on comments that you'll be accepting those? And how long would that period last?

Matthew Meyer: Yes. So the period for comment is going to be open-ended. So you're looking through the future, providing comments to that [strategicplan@nrc.gov](mailto:strategicplan@nrc.gov) will be, you know, throughout the year. So if you have additional comments, we will be able to receive those and incorporate them into future drafts.

So don't feel limited by a timeframe for the next full draft. We have it open so that members of the public, industry, anyone that wants to provide comments throughout the year can through that email address. And they, you know, will be considered and documented and provided into, as appropriate, the future versions that we'll be addressing.

John Butler: Great.

Catherine Haney: Yes, but John, the sooner we do have the comments, though, the better that we can factor them into the system earlier. For - I mean, for example, if we don't

get something until, you know, Christmas timeframe, it's going to be hard for us to get it into some of the documentation.

John Butler: And you've already mentioned the draft to OMB is going in September. So I clearly understand that. That quite - giving you enough time to incorporate into that draft would be appropriate.

Matt, don't leave. I got another question for you on the Evidence Building Plan.

The safety and security objective one states in part that the agency maintains technically sound and rigorous licensing oversight processes commensurate with the risk of the regulated entity or regulated activity. Will the evidence plan and I'm thinking, in particular, priority question four include any plans to address whether or not the licensing oversight processes are "Commensurate" with the risk of the regulated activity?

Matthew Meyer: Okay. So if you want to bring that slide up, Lance. Let's go to fourth question.

Lance Rakovan: Which number is it? I'm sorry,

Matthew Meyer: It's going to be the fourth question. Keep going.

Lance Rakovan: Question four. Yes or no?

Matthew Meyer: No. Keep going. Next one, (did pass it).

Lance Rakovan: Do you know what Slide Number it is?

Matthew Meyer: Which slide were you referring to, Doug (sic)?

John Butler: No. I was referring to the documents that were provided prior to the meeting.

Matthew Meyer: Okay.

John Butler: It was the priority question four. It's associated with goal two. It says to what extent...

Matthew Meyer: (So next) slide. No. Not there. I believe you're referring to the one that's talking about licensing actions and doing the historic review, just to ensure that we have an adequate or more or less resources have been expended. Is that the one you're referring to?

John Butler: Yes. Yes, I mean.

Matthew Meyer: Yes. I mean, and so we're taking a deeper dive into that question to understand, you know, where the resources have been put in place, understanding, you know, where the variances are and the amount of staff, resources, and hours being expended. So definitely part of that understanding of the variance that we may see as we evaluate that data, it's better risk-informed our processes.

And so when you start to see variances for the similar types of licensing actions, we'll have to take a deeper dive and understand why that variance is being - is occurring.

And to take that a little further is that we have a be risk smart initiative that we used for our - that was part of our transformation initiative. And that'll provide a better understanding for our staff and to take a look at that, using that

process to have a risk-informed decision of how we or what we're looking at for licensing actions.

So I think it will be part of that evaluation as we go forward.

John Butler: Well, I mean, one of the questions always comes to my mind when I'm looking at the growing cost of reviews for our advanced reactors is these are designs that are demonstrably safer than prior designs. Yet the costs of those reviews are going up. So it's hard for me to rationalize that the reviews are, you know, commensurate with the risk. So that's the type of investigation I would love to see this priority question four get into.

Matthew Meyer: Yes. And we'll have to let the data drive us towards where we focus on which licensing actions. So I can't promise where that data will take us as we start to analyze different licensing actions. But I guess that risk informing is something that we're trying to enhance and continue to enhance for the agency. So we'll definitely be looking at those risk aspects as well.

John Butler: Sort of a related question, Matt, of the evidence-building activities, are they going to be tied in any significant way to the Strategic Plan? I mean, for example, will they - evidence-building activities be included as contributing activities in the Strategic Plan?

Matthew Meyer: So as a broader spectrum from what the Evidence Act is, the priority questions are partly evidence-building. In a sense. However, everything that we do, such as licensing actions, the rulemakings that we perform, all of that generates evidence. So that is all really considered evidence-building under the NRC's activities.

So, yes, and all of this is really tied back to each of those goals and those objectives. The priority questions, as you saw on the slides are also linked to the strategic goals. It really is going to be used to provide that evidence needed to make those decisions by our decision-makers at our agency and inform us to improve and make changes to our agency as we go forward. I think it's very vital that we have that as a very flexible, and we'll do this annually as a process to continuously update the Evidence Building Plan and really make some significant changes as we go forward and find out what that evidence is telling us.

John Butler: Will any of this be made publicly available?

Matthew Meyer: The Evidence Building Plan is actually going to be in our Strategic Plan, so it'll be publicly available with that final version (unintelligible).

John Butler: Well, I'm speaking more on the annual assessment for reviews or I mean, certainly, the...

Matthew Meyer: It's - go ahead.

John Butler: Yes. The updates.

Matthew Meyer: Yes. The updates will be provided to our commission, normal procedures that we have in our internal agency processes. But the outcome of that would be updated for the Strategic Plan. So there would be an update that would be viewable publicly available.

We are also developing a Web site that includes all of our evidence-building activities for our agency. And that will provide additional updates, as well as documentation associated with the findings from some of our - as appropriate

some of the priority questions that are being developed or significant evaluations for agency. And that will all be publicly available to get what the status updates, the objectives of that evaluation or evidence-building activity, whatever it may be, as well as the documentation behind it.

John Butler: If you will allow me, I have one other question here. The agency annual goals and performance objectives. Are they going to be established to reflect the Strategic Plan goals and objectives? And will they be periodically reported in a way that's publicly available?

Matthew Meyer: So we are still looking through what we want to be able to provide on that web page that I just referenced.

But our performance indicators associated with the congressional budget justification are already made publicly available. Understand that that's an annual basis. But we're definitely considering whether we should expand that to be a little more transparent on a quarterly basis. But there's no promises of what we're going to be producing in the future. But we're definitely taking a look at different ways that we could communicate to the public our performance, as well as our status updates on our Strategic Plan to meet our objectives and goals.

John Butler: Thank you.

Catherine Haney: Hey Lance, before we go on, let me just use this as an opportunity to go to John and possibly Doug on this, because I've heard this comment several times through different conversations about the linkage of the Strategic Plan and the performance indicators and making them, the linkage more, I guess, I'm going to use the word obvious to the public and to our stakeholders.

And really both Doug and John kind of commented on that. It would be helpful if you could give maybe a little bit - give me a little bit of insights on what you're looking for specifically so that as we go forward with what Matt was suggesting, we're looking at what more we can do. I mean, it could help shape if you would want to just give us a little bit more information.

Doug True: I'll jump in John. This is Doug True from NEI. I think where that comment comes from is that in private companies, when you are - when you make a Strategic Plan that is tied back then into the operational system and then all the way down into employee's performance objectives for the year.

And you want a line of sight from what the employee is doing all the way to the strategic objective that it is trying to support. So they know how they tie in.

Personally, I'm less worried about what you put in someone's performance objectives than their performance management system. But and so if that's a message that I gave you, I'm not sure that's feasible for us to see what you put in people's performance objectives.

But from a functioning perspective, being able to establish that you have that connection and it's being driven and people are being held accountable for those things that are there - been - have been put in place to meet those strategic objectives, I think is what I think should be in the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

And that was in our letter, one of the CNO and CEO letter that went in last November as well was just making sure that connection exists so that people are held to accomplish the goals that you want to set out.



So I'll let John jump in. And if he was saying something different than he can add to that.

John Butler: No, not at all, Doug. You stated it very well.

Catherine Haney: Okay. That's helpful. I mean, and that is really what I was thinking. And it really is that looking to the tie into from the Strategic Plan down to our operating plans. So Doug, thank you for that, those insights. So, Lance, back to you.

Lance Rakovan: Very good. It looks like Jason Zorn, you have your hand up as well.

Jason Zorn: Yes. Thanks, Lance. This is Jason Zorn again, from Exelon. Question about - this goes to the Key External Factors document. I know that NEI's, you know, letters to the NRC and the draft to their plan, and in Doug's comments earlier, you know, there's a mention about climate change.

And it's - you know, I would note that the key external factors doesn't really get into climate change, at least not at a high-level. You know it recognizes a couple of references in it about an impact on energy infrastructure.

But it seems that given the significance of the issue as a national priority and a policy level under the Biden Administration that acknowledging climate change and the importance of nuclear towards climate change would be at least referenced in these key external factors.

And, you know, I recognize that the NRC, you know, has a position about, you know, its ability to regulate - it's a safety regulator and a regulator for safety in nuclear power plants. But at the same time, the key external factors

don't seem to be limited to factors that are under the NRC's control. In fact, they seem to be largely outside of the NRC's control.

So I would just - it's I guess a question in a comment about, you know, taking another look at that through that lens of, you know, whether or not the NRC has any specific role in that, it's still is an external factor that is taken on a significantly higher weight in, you know, the last few years.

So I guess my question would be, is there a reason - was that considered and not included in the key external factors? Was it not considered at all? And if not, you know, could you - do you think it's worth considering?

Matthew Meyer: So it was definitely considered. And I remember your comments. And I think there's a fine line between considering that and putting that into the Strategic Plan and by law, the NRC cannot be promoting nuclear energy, its use.

So I think we'll take a look at it again. But it does beg the question of, you know, that that promote nuclear power moving forward?

But it's definitely a factor that is consideration to definitely influence our workload in the future. And we'll take a look at that.

Jason Zorn: Thanks, Matt. And I just would, you know, just as a quick response to that, I would note that, you know, there's a couple of things in the key external factors, you know, market pressures and globalization where - which arguably could be the factor in there could be promotional because you're mentioning that, you know, there are marketing inefficiencies right now and nuclear technology might be globalized. So it's not so much about promotion as much as it does it have an impact on the field that you're regulating, at least from, you know, from my perspective.

Matthew Meyer: No. Thank you for the comment. It's a good point. I'll take a look at that.

Lance Rakovan: All right, looks like I've got a couple of hands. Mr. Butler, your hand is up again if you'd like the floor.

John Butler: Yes. I just want to follow up on the discussion we just had with Jason. And the modern risk-informed regulator performing activities in the most efficient and effective manner. All that plays into not being a unnecessary, nonsupportive factor of the industries or the nation's goals and objectives for producing carbon.

So there is a way for NRC to support those goals and objectives without promoting nuclear. So I don't think NRC should step away from that so quickly.

Lance Rakovan: Okay. And Mr. True, it looks like your hand up is up again.

Doug True: Yes. I'm just going to triple down on this point. Because it seems like the elephant in the room. And to say that that external factor doesn't affect the NRC by workload, by prioritization, by otherwise, I think is just missing what's happening in the nation right now.

And I don't think - I think you can do it in a way that isn't promotional. We need the NRC to be a strong independent regulator. That's not the point. The point is that that work has to be done in the context of these other factors and finding that balance is something that the NRC is going to have to manage its way through in this time period, which to me makes it be very important that you figure out how to frame that in a way that supports both the nation's needs and your need to be an independent regulator.

So I, you know, sorry for piling on. But I feel strongly that and I think our letters tried to communicate that as well. It isn't about promotion. It's about recognizing the factors that are out there.

Lance Rakovan: Okay. Thank you for that. Let me check-in with (Vanessa). (Vanessa) any callers?

Coordinator: Yes. Mike, your line is open. Mike, your line is open.

Mike Callahan: Thank you very much. This is Mike Callahan. And I'm monitoring today on behalf of Wayne Norton and the Decommissioning Plant Coalition. And I'm just going to steal a moment of the time here, Jason and Doug and John, to talk about materials. And particularly in your external factors, I think there's a gap that may be missing in terms of the changing landscape of materials, licensees in general in the NRC.

Number one, you're accumulating more decommissioning nuclear power plants.

Number two, you could well be up to 41 agreement states that will now be responsible for regulating material usages other than decommissioning and spent fuel storage and the like. The rub here comes in that as time goes on and as far as the current operating fleet shuts down, there needs to be some measurement, an alert, a measure of being alert to the amount of time and effort the remaining materials' licensees are going to have to devote. And it eventually, too, gets around to fees as the materials base shrinks, as the reactor base shrinks. And I'm going to be very supportive in that the current reactor fee not being levied on the advanced reactors as they come out, I'll be very supportive of that. But it is - makes it imperative that risk informing and efficiency take hold at the NRC.

So that's just a gap I identify in your external factors and is that there's a shrinking number of materials' licensees that either generate the amount of revenue in the case of decommissioning plants they - sites they don't generate revenue.

And a shrinking number of materials' licenses can be impacted a lot if - by the increase in fees that would be levied on them if you're not paying attention to this as an external factor.

Thanks for the time to comment. And I turn it back to Jason and Doug and John.

Lance Rakovan: Very good. (Vanessa), was that the only commenter that we had on the phone line?

Coordinator: Yes, sir. We show no further questions at this time.

Lance Rakovan: Thank you so much. Okay. So I don't see any hands right now. So I what I want to do is just go through the questions one more time just to see if folks have any additional questions or comments that they would like to make given, again, these kinds of questions that we produce to kind of focus the discussions a bit today or at least to kind of facilitate discussion on the things that we were hoping to hear about.

How can the NRC better share its progress toward the draft goals and objectives in a way that is meaningful to you?

Are there any important factors the NRC should consider when developing answers for the priority questions?

What information or data would be beneficial to include in the Strategic Plan?

What actions can the NRC take to continue building stakeholder confidence?

What contributing activities should be considered to support the draft goals and objectives?

And how can the NRC better communicate using modern technology, that is social media, crowdsourcing?

So again, these - you know, if you have any other comments that you'd like to share, again, these are to hopefully facilitate some thoughts and let you know what we're looking to hear about. We'll pause for a little while and give folks a chance.

(Vanessa), if anybody pops up, please let us know.

Looks like John Butler would like the floor again. John, go ahead.

John Butler: Well, I'm going to go back and double down on an earlier discussion on the - having an opportunity between this high-level summary and the full draft. You know, I would ask that you give good consideration to what avenues of discussion we can have on that full draft, whether it's making it available in some form and giving a period of time for comment. But if nothing else, arranging an opportunity similar as to today's opportunity to share that full draft and having an opportunity for some public discussion before it becomes final.

So please give some consideration to that. And, you know, I know there was an action taken earlier to get back to us on how our earlier comments on the Strategic Plan process are being addressed or resolved. And I ask that you give further consideration to that. I think that would be very valuable for that same discussion that we're talking about right now. So thank you.

Lance Rakovan: Very good. Thank you for that. Anyone else? Jason, please.

Jason Zorn: Yes. Thanks. I promise my last comment. Just that I really wanted to just echo what John was saying about the, you know, future engagement and, in particular, the, you know, the questions, you know, the comments that have already been submitted, you know, I recognize and seize on it a timeline. But in some ways, it's helpful to see. Well, in many ways it's helpful to see what the NRC's response is to some of the comments were made, because and it can be counterproductive to continue to make the same comment over and over again, not realizing that, you know, the NRC disagrees with it or for whatever the reasons might be, isn't going to adopt it. So it seems more efficient on everyone's part, at least, to see some explanation of, you know, what the NRC's position is on a given subject.

So that's just a comment. And one very quick final comment is just going back to the climate change discussion. I know the NRC had an independent assessment done a few years ago. I think it was 20 - completed in 2016 or '17, the, you know, so-called (unintelligible) Assessment.

And there's a very specific acknowledgment or recognition of the impacts, you know, climate change has on the future of the nuclear industry in that which, you know, again, I would just direct your attention to that in terms of looking at the Strategic Plan, because there is an acknowledgment that, you know, as Doug said, it has an - it externally exists. Does - and it will impact

the NRC. Whether or not it affects specifically how the NRC goes about its business is a different question. Thank you.

Lance Rakovan: Very good. Mr. Butler.

John Butler: You know, these questions for discussion, I know they were intended primarily to prompt discussion during this call, but I think there are some good questions here.

And I'd like to say that we're going to take the opportunity following this meeting to see if we can come up with some, you know, more in-depth responses to these questions and try to provide those to you in a timely fashion. So that's something we'll be doing following this call.

Lance Rakovan: Very good. Okay. Let me check in. (Vanessa), any callers on the line wanting the floor?

Coordinator: We show no callers at this time.

Lance Rakovan: Okay. Want to give an opportunity. Again, this is certainly not a speak now or forever hold your peace kind of thing. If you have further comments after this, again, the email is [strategicplan@nrc.gov](mailto:strategicplan@nrc.gov). I hope that's right. I don't have it in front of me right now. I'm going from memory.

Matthew Meyer: That's correct, Lance.

Lance Rakovan: Okay, thank you. I'm glad I got you watching my back. All right, Cathy was there - did you want to close this out today?



Catherine Haney: I can close this out. I would like to thank everyone for participating and providing us comments. And clearly, I took lots of notes. You gave us some things to think about, some things we'll check on, you know, definitely the comment relative to climate change, getting more information out into the public, the - how comments were resolved before. We'll go back and chat about those things so they - I just want you to know that they are so noted and we'll take them into consideration.

Please contribute - continue to provide us input on this. We are looking at input that we're receiving as we're going forward and finding it very helpful. And again, the - I think all of you have our information. So you can always go in through that Web site. But please feel free to and to email Matt or me, if you have any additional comments or things that you'd like us to consider.

So with that, I want to thank Lance for facilitating the meeting and for Matt and Carla for making the presentations and being available to answer questions. And I hope everyone has a great afternoon. Thanks very much.

Man: Thank you.

Lance Rakovan: Thanks, everyone. With that, we're closed.

Doug True: Thanks.

Coordinator: That concludes today's conference. You may disconnect at this time.

Lance Rakovan: Thank you, (Vanessa).

END