

## **U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Public Meeting Summary**

May 20, 2026

**Title:** Executive Order 14300 Rulemaking – Licensing Requirements for Microreactors and Other Reactors with Comparable Risk Profiles

**Meeting Identifier:** 20260503

**Date of Meeting:** May 20, 2026

**Location:** Virtual Meeting - Webinar (via Microsoft Teams)

**Type of Meeting:** Information Meeting with a Question and Answer Session

### **Purpose of Meeting:**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff hosted a public meeting on May 20, 2026 to present the published proposed rule (91 FR 23628) related to amending its regulations to establish a risk-informed and performance-based regulatory framework for rapid licensing of new microreactors and other reactors with comparable risk profiles and for high-volume deployment of these reactors. The proposed rule would provide a flexible set of licensing pathways, reduce regulatory burden, and ensure that safety and security requirements remain commensurate with the potential hazards posed by these facilities.

### **General Details:**

To support the expedited timelines and efficiency directives in the Accelerating Deployment of Versatile, Advanced Nuclear for Clean Energy (ADVANCE) Act and Executive Order (E.O.) 14300, "Ordering the Reform of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission," the NRC has published a proposed rule that would safely expedite the licensing process for microreactors and other reactors with comparable risk profiles. The proposed changes would make hearings faster, more efficient, and less burdensome, while maintaining fairness for all parties and ensuring accurate hearing decisions.

This proposed rule is part of broader reforms from E.O. 14300 aimed at increasing U.S. nuclear capacity and reestablishing the United States as the global leader in nuclear energy. E.O. 14300 imposes 18-month and 1-year decision-making deadlines for certain applications and directs the NRC to adopt shorter deadlines when appropriate.

The proposed rule includes major reform measures that would:

- Establish flexible licensing pathways with streamlined requirements
- Provide opportunities for expedited licensing reviews to construct new reactors
- Establish performance-based and risk-informed entry criteria essential for rapid, high-volume licensing
- Allow applicants to propose appropriate use of codes and standards based on their specific application

The proposed rule and additional documents related to this rulemaking are available on regulations.gov under Docket ID NRC-2025-0379.

### **Summary of Presentation:**

Lance Rakovan of the NRC opened the meeting, reviewed the agenda and meeting logistics, and clarified that no regulatory decisions were going to be made at the meeting. Mr. Rakovan then introduced Christian Araguas and Cinthya Roman-Cuevas of the

NRC who presented on the proposed rule. Mr. Araguas discussed the reason for the new rule, core components of the rule, who may benefit from the rule, related rules (e.g., Part 50), and entry criteria. Ms. Roman-Cuevas discussed the benefits of clear entry criteria, enablers of rapid deployment, examples of risk-informed requirements, and implementation guidance.

The NRC is specifically seeking feedback on the following topics: risk-informed entry criteria, licensing modernization, microreactor deployment, operational flexibility, and regulatory interfaces.

The NRC staff reminded attendees that the 45-day comment period ends on June 15, 2026, and provided information on the rulemaking docket and how to submit public comments.

### **Public Questions:**

- A stakeholder urged the NRC to focus on high-volume licensing of both microreactors and modular reactors in accordance with section 5(e) of E.O. 14300.
  - This stakeholder raised a question about applicants who may not have a sufficiently mature, qualifying design under Part 57, and asked if it is intended that these applicants could apply under existing regulations while also taking part in the transformative elements of Part 57.
- A couple of stakeholders asked what the 1 rem criterion means.
- A stakeholder asked how applicants will demonstrate that they are prepared to meet the 1 rem criterion, and how the public can see this information.
- A stakeholder stated that their experience is that it takes a while to investigate and evaluate site safety conditions. They asked how site safety evaluations will be addressed for so many locations within a short period of time.
- A stakeholder asked if Part 57 entry requirements are inclusive.
- A stakeholder asked what is considered heavy metal per the proposed rule's requirements.
- A stakeholder referenced a recently published Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS) letter report that raises issues with the rule, including that it is too broad in scope, and asked how the NRC staff plans to respond.
- A stakeholder asked about plant parameter and site parameter envelope values in Table C-1 of appendix C, noting the values appear more stringent, and whether the NRC has considered codifying other tables in Part 57 itself, keeping Table C-1 in guidance. The stakeholder said low-consequence reactors may have trouble meeting the values in Table C-1.
- A stakeholder expressed that while § 57.350 excludes cooling systems using groundwater from categorical exclusions, previous reviews have determined that cooling systems don't have a large impact on surrounding waters, and asked if the NRC has considered if this requirement is appropriate.
- A stakeholder asked for clarification on what can and cannot be licensed, as discussed in the *Federal Register* Notice (FRN).
- A stakeholder asked for clarification on why categorical exclusion cannot be granted if an applicant requests exemption from any other part of the rule.
- A stakeholder asked for the rule to include more clarity on meeting the requirements for Generic Environmental Impact Statements (GEIS), which they noted is part of the NRC's regulations as opposed to the guidance.

- A stakeholder asked, for compliance with the Endangered Species Act, if the NRC staff consider developing integrated elements similar to the Department of Energy's (DOE) categorical exclusions.
- A stakeholder asked if it is the NRC staff's expectation that dose criterion is only applied to individual reactors, or if it will be added together if connected to a power generation system.
- A stakeholder asked why the rule is limited to class 103 reactors and closed to class 104 facilities.
- A stakeholder asked if it is the NRC staff's intent that a construction permit (CP) holder would need to review all changes to information affected by the Final Safety Analysis Report (FSAR), even if it is not actively required by the NRC to issue a CP. They asked if the NRC staff would review the initial FSAR, or if applicants need to provide updates to the FSAR prior to issuance of an operating license (OL).
- A stakeholder asked if applicants can request exemptions related to the site boundary if the reactor design implements passive safety features, and asked if Part 57 will allow urban siting.
- A stakeholder asked if the NRC staff would include concise guidance on maximum hypothetical accidents (MHA) and source terms.
- A stakeholder asked if cybersecurity protections would be retained due to the absence of an alternative protection standard.
- A stakeholder asked how the NRC determined in the proposed rule's regulatory analysis that 90% of cost savings come from quality assurance requirements.
- A stakeholder stated that § 57.53(b)(2) could be read to require an applicant to demonstrate compliance with every applicable authorization.
- A stakeholder asked how a microreactor developer might determine whether to use Part 53 or Part 57.
- A stakeholder asked for the rationale behind foreclosing on a CP Preliminary Safety Analysis Report (PSAR) pathway for a first-of-a-kind reactor design.
- A stakeholder asked if it is intended that applicants under Part 57 would need to submit security plans for review and approval.
- A stakeholder stated that NUREG-2271, "Guidelines for Preparing and Reviewing Applications Under 10 CFR Part 57," presents guidance to address physical security requirements, and asked the NRC staff to explain what is meant by stylized features and provide examples of low probably assumptions.
- A stakeholder stated that the NRC has had recent experience with the SHINE medical isotope facility that did not meet the traditional definition of a reactor but was licensed under Part 50.
- A stakeholder asked if the population distribution requirement in the proposed rule is intended to be a step up from what is traditionally done in Part 100.
- A stakeholder asked if developers are looking to order and deploy reactors within days or weeks, is the intent for each reactor to get a license in 6 months, or is there a provision that would accommodate deployment in a short time frame.
- A stakeholder stated that the definition of safe shutdown in Part 57 seems to imply design-basis accident (DBA) plus station blackout beyond-design-basis events (BDBEs) in comparison to the definition of safe shutdown in § 50.2.
- A stakeholder asked if the NRC envisions scenarios where manufacturing license (ML) holders and CP holders are different legal entities.

## **Closing:**

- Mr. Rakovan expressed appreciation to the attendees and encouraged them to submit their feedback as public comments. Mr. Rakovan reiterated the comment period is open until June 15, 2026.

**Action Items/Next Steps:**

This concluded the public meeting to discuss the Licensing Requirements for Microreactors and Other Reactors with Comparable Risk Profiles proposed rule.

**Related Documents:**

- ML26112A077 – *Federal Register* Notice, “Licensing Requirements for Microreactors and Other Reactors with Comparable Risk Profiles; Proposed Rule; Guidance; and Request for Comment”
- ML26127A231 – Public Meeting Notice, “Executive Order 14300 Rulemaking - Licensing Requirements for Microreactors and Other Reactors With Comparable Risk Profiles 05/20/2026”
- ML26139A240 – Public Meeting Presentation Slides, “5/20/2026 NRC Public Meeting Slides – ‘Executive Order 14300: Licensing Requirements for Microreactors and Other Reactors with Comparable Risk Profiles’”
- ML26133A238 – ACRS Letter Report, “Proposed Rulemaking on Licensing Requirements for Microreactors and Other Reactors with Comparable Risk Profiles (10 CFR PART 57)”