

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

31st ANNUAL REGULATORY INFORMATION CONFERENCE

+ + + + +

COMMISSIONER BARAN PLENARY

+ + + + +

TUESDAY,

MARCH 12, 2019

+ + + + +

ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

+ + + + +

The Regulatory Information Conference
convened at the Bethesda North Marriott Hotel &
Conference Center, 5701 Marinelli Road, at 9:30 a.m.

PRESENT:

JEFF BARAN, Commissioner, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission

RAYMOND FURSTENAU, Director, Office of Nuclear
Regulatory Research

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

P R O C E E D I N G S

(9:33 a.m.)

MR. FURSTENAU: To continue with our primary program, it's my pleasure to introduce our next speaker, Commissioner Jeff Baran. The Honorable Mr. Baran was sworn in as Commissioner in October of 2014. He's currently serving a term ending in 2023.

During his tenure, Commissioner Baran's priorities have included a strong focus on safety as the Agency adapts to changing workload, requiring and implementing effective safety enhancements in response to Fukushima Daiichi accident, improving oversight of power reactors entering decommissioning and boosting the openness and transparency of Agency decision-making.

Over the past four years he had visited operating power reactors and nuclear plants undergoing action decommissioning, research and test reactors. We went on a tour of one together, Commissioner Baran. Nuclear plant fuel cycle facilities, a low-level waste facility, and a various of other facilities using radioactive materials. He's also been to Fukushima Daiichi for a firsthand look at conditions and activities on the sight.

As was mentioned in the introduction by

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Ho Nieh, the Commissioners are hosting some technical sessions and I'm going to make a pitch for a Commissioner Baran session this afternoon.

Technical session, T3, regional session on the current nuclear power-plant regulatory issues, that's at 1:30 p.m. in Ballroom D, and you're running neck and neck with the Chairman on who's having the most attendees so maybe this will take care of that.

So with that, Commissioner Baran? Thank you.

COMMISSIONER BARAN: Thanks, Ray. Good morning, it's great to see everyone here, we'll try to further boost attendance for this afternoon.

After four RIC speeches I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that there aren't very many cheesy nuclear jokes out there and most of them are really quite bad. So, I am dropping them from the speech, I'm done with them.

Frankly, I'm tired of the pained groans, they're demoralizing when you're up here, but I am not going to leave you in the lurch. I am going to meet your demands for comedic levity, which brings me to NUREG- 0544, NRC's legendary collection of abbreviations.

Now, I suspect that some of you might not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

believe that NRC actually published a 37-page tome of impenetrable acronyms so I brought it along. Here it is. I am not making this up, it's real. Ho, maybe you could load this into the mobile app, people could have this.

This is actually, it says right here, Revision 5, which means we actually went through the exercise of assembling every imaginable nuclear abbreviation six times.

The latest version was lovingly put together by a Working Group of 20 NRC employees. To those 20 individuals, I don't know who you offended to get that assignment but on behalf of the Commission, please allow me to formally apologize.

According to the abstract, the goal of this NUREG is to improve communication with and within the NRC. Terrific goal, insurance 37 pages of abbreviations gets you there, but I digress.

I actually got through the NUREG and I still don't really understand what NUREG stands for. But this document is nothing short of riveting. It includes some great questions to ponder.

One section is titled: Why Use Abbreviations? Good question. Another section asks: What is Plain Language? It was at that point

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I figured we were in real trouble.

But if you suspend your disbelief and temporarily accept the premise that the world can be made better through abbreviations, there's some great stuff in there.

When you hear the word badger, you may think of a cute animal or the act of pestering someone, or a student at the University of Wisconsin, Commissioner Caputo's alma mater. But at NRC, BADGER means **Boron-10 Areal Density Gauge for Evaluating Racks**.

If someone says that's CLASSI, you may think you are the recipient of a nice compliment. Do not be fooled or flattered, that NRC employee is trying to tell you about a **Continuum Linear Analysis of Soil-structure Interaction**.

At NRC CPR is not a life-saving procedure. It is the Common Prioritization of Rulemaking. Watch out for that.

If the mention of EPICUR makes you think a gourmet lunch is coming your way, you will be sorely disappointed to learn that what may be in the offering is an Experimental Program for Iodine Chemistry under Irradiation.

That's four abbreviations. There are just over 1000 to go so we'll have something to look

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

forward to for next year I guess.

Now, in fairness to the Agency, the preface does say in an ideal environment the NRC would not require a reference book of abbreviations. I would like to think we can all agree on that.

The NUREG also advises us to avoid using abbreviations whenever possible, and in all seriousness, I think that's good advice. As an independent safety regulator serving the public, transparency, openness, and clear communication are critical to NRC's success.

When we share as much information as we can, describe the issues and the Agency's work in understandable language and are open to the feedback we receive, then interested stakeholders can meaningfully participate in regulatory discussions and NRC makes better decisions.

Since last year's RIC, a new conversation started about transformation and innovation at NRC. The staff has begun to focus on how we as an Agency make decisions and how we communicate with each other and external stakeholders. I heard a little bit about that earlier this morning.

Regardless of whether we label a transformation, I think this particular effort makes

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

a lot of sense. We need to identify the full range of views early so we can carefully consider them as we move through the decision-making process.

Ultimately, we want the decision-maker to have an open-minded and thorough analysis of the different options and viewpoints. There's no question in my mind that when we do this well, it improves the quality of the decisions we make.

In my time this morning, I want to share my thoughts about how NRC should approach transformation and give you some concrete examples of potential changes I see as positive and changes I believe would take us in the wrong direction.

In my view, it makes sense to consider transformational change when a new technology challenges NRC's existing regulatory approach or when the Agency has historically struggled to regulate effectively in a particular area.

On the other hand, when a regulatory process has worked well over the years, it's better to pursue targeted refinements aimed at solving clearly defined problems.

Whether NRC is considering a major transformational change or a more modest incremental change, we must keep our focus squarely on our safety

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

and security mission.

Transformation at NRC can't be about rolling back safety and security standards to save money and it can't be about fewer inspections or weaker oversight. That would take NRC in the wrong direction.

When considered with these criteria in mind, some of the transformational changes proposed by the staff or external stakeholders pass muster, and others do not.

There are ideas we should explore as part of this effort and other ideas we should reject as inconsistent with our mission as an independent safety regulator.

A strong case for transformation can be made when it comes to updating NRC's regulations to account for non-light water reactor technologies. NRC's current power reactor regulations were written for light water reactors, which make up the entire existing fleet.

So it makes sense to update those requirements to address different technologies. NRC is already doing a lot of work in this area and I support developing a performance-based technology-inclusive regulation for the licensing of non-light

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

water reactors.

As the Agency proceeds with this effort, it will be important to balance the broad rulemaking activities with the need to focus sufficient resources on the design-specific work for particular applications.

The staff also recommends developing a new Digital Instrumentation and Control regulation based on high-level performance-based safety design principles rather than highly prescriptive standards.

The new rule likely would move away from exclusive reliance on one set of consensus standards and establish a process by which Applicants could meet alternative standards that have been successfully used in other industries and countries.

NRC's regulatory approach to Digital Instrumentation and Control would seem to be a strong candidate for transformational change. Over the years, NRC has struggled with this complex set of issues.

It has proven to be a real challenge to ensure that digital upgrades are done safely and do not introduce any unacceptable risks while establishing a reliable regulatory framework for making these upgrades.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Although digital technology has been around for decades and is used extensively in other sectors of the economy, U.S. nuclear power-plants still rely primarily on analog technology and components.

As a practical matter, digital represents a new technology that challenges our existing regulatory framework.

Because Digital Instrumentation and Control technology has rapidly evolved in recent decades and will continue to do so, it is particularly ill-suited to rigid standards and prescriptive guidance.

If other sectors of the economy or nuclear regulators in other countries have had success with alternative consensus standards, it makes sense for NRC to evaluate whether compliance with these standards could be an acceptable way of meeting NRC's safety and security requirements.

On the other hand, I am concerned that a near-term rulemaking to establish this new regulatory framework could shift focus away from the current efforts to improve key guidance documents at a time when significant progress is being made.

I do not want to lose the momentum we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

have right now, and if updated guidance is able to effectively resolve the major regulatory challenges and provide a predictable framework for making digital upgrades, I have a hard time seeing the case for setting that guidance aside and starting from scratch with a new rule.

Instead of deciding now whether to initiate a rulemaking some time down the road, I think it would be better to first see whether updating the guidance proves to be an effective solution.

Although I am open-minded about ultimately pursuing a transformative digital instrument and control rulemaking, I believe the staff should complete the ongoing efforts, allow the new guidance to be used for a period of time, and then determine the extent to which the new guidance resolves the challenges in this area.

At that point, we can decide whether rulemaking is still needed. There are a lot of ideas for making changes to the engineering inspection program, some good and some not so good.

Engineering inspections are an essential part of the suite of baseline inspections conducted at every operating nuclear power-plant across the country.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

They play an important role in verifying that safety systems are capable of performing their intended safety functions under accident conditions.

NRC began conducting engineering inspections in response to a significant safety event at Davis-Besse in 1985 and these inspections have evolved over the years to confront emerging issues and new findings.

As the NRC staff's Engineering Inspection Working Group concluded, the current suite of engineering inspections is effective in identifying safety issues.

In fact, since the year 2000, these inspections have resulted in over 2000 inspection findings. Most of the findings were green but several were white or even yellow.

The Working Group explained that one of the reasons the engineering inspection program added value to reactor safety was its ability to identify latent conditions that would not manifest themselves through routine plant surveillance activities.

This helped NRC inspectors identify defective components before they failed. So although many of the performance deficiencies identified over the years were of lower risk significance, some of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

these deficiencies would have become more risk-significant if NRC hadn't caught them early before component failure.

The Commissioner is currently considering options for modifying the engineering inspections. The staff recommends replacing the current design bases assurance inspection and some other regional team engineering inspections with a comprehensive engineering team inspection complemented by focused engineering inspections.

There's an acronym for all that so be assured it's all okay. The comprehensive engineering team inspection would verify the ability of plant components to perform their licensing basis functions following plant modifications.

The staff recommends performing them on a four-year cycle. In the years they are not performed at a plant, a focused engineering inspection would be performed instead. These inspections would focus narrowly on a particular engineering area which would change each year.

So there are two basic changes being contemplated here. First, a shift in the content and focus of each year's engineering inspection and second, a reduction in the frequency of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

comprehensive engineering inspection.

I believe the first change would improve both safety and efficiency, the second change would do neither. NRC would just be doing less.

There is a solid safety basis for moving from the current inspection to the newly designed inspections, which were developed based on feedback from inspectors in the field.

The safety advantage of the focused engineering inspection is that it will focus on different and often uninspected safety- significant areas each year.

This provides the NRC staff with the flexibility to shift the engineering inspection focus to areas of emerging need as the nuclear power-plant fleet ages.

On the other hand, reducing the frequency of the comprehensive engineering inspection from once every three years to once every four years would reduce inspections solely to reduce costs.

The baseline inspection program is at the heart of what the NRC does to ensure that nuclear power-plants operate safely. There is no persuasive rationale rooted in safety for reducing the frequency of comprehensive engineering inspections. NRC

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

should not inspect less in order to save money.

Some stakeholders argue that NRC should accept licensee self-assessments in lieu of independent NRC engineering inspections.

They suggest that NRC allow industry self-assessments to replicate NRC inspections in other areas too, such as radiation protection, emergency preparedness, and security. NRC should not head in this direction.

These are foundational baseline inspections that since the beginning of the Reactor Oversight Process have been viewed by NRC as necessary for every nuclear power-plant in the country, regardless of licensee performance.

These baseline inspections are essential and NRC inspectors need to be independently conducting them. We should not allow licensees to inspect themselves in lieu of NRC inspections.

We need to ask ourselves why does NRC conduct inspections in the first place? Because our independent inspectors find problems that licensees don't, because licensees perform better and more safely with us performing rigorous independent oversight.

Because the public has entrusted NRC, a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

public agency that works for them, with the responsibility of establishing standards to protect their health and safety and enforcing those standards impartially.

None of those purposes are met when licensees are allowed to inspect themselves. This concept is fundamentally inconsistent with our mission as an independent safety regulator.

There is nothing wrong with licensees performing self-assessments for their own purposes. In fact, licensees routinely conduct self-assessments in advance of significant NRC inspections to gauge their readiness.

But when NRC inspectors then conduct those inspections, our inspectors still identify issues that the self-assessments did not. The thousands of engineering inspection findings over the years conclusively demonstrate that.

Several other transformation concepts being discussed involve different aspects of the Reactor Oversight Process.

As a general matter, I would be weary of making any radical changes to the Reactor Oversight Process because it has generally been an effective safety framework.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

The program is not static, adjustments are routinely made to inspection focus areas, inspection samples, and inspection procedures.

When problems do emerge, we need to clearly define and address them, but in a program that is generally working well, it will usually make sense to address specific, well analyzed challenges through targeted refinements rather than sweeping transformations.

Let me give you a few examples of potential Reactor Oversight Process changes that raise concerns for me. One proposal is for NRC to conduct fewer baseline inspections for plants that are performing well.

Since the very beginning of the Reactor Oversight Process, the basic premise of baseline inspections has been that these are the minimum inspections that should be performed for every plant in the country regardless of performance. So this would be a huge change.

I worry that if we went down this road, we would see more cyclical up and down performance from plants. We know that performance doesn't improve with less oversight, it declines. That's why NRC performs oversight in the first place.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I strongly believe that we should not do less than the minimum on inspections. Another set of proposals focuses on minimizing the importance of white findings.

Some argue that only a yellow or red finding should result in a column change in the action matrix and an increase in NRC oversight. They also say that white findings should be quickly closed so that they don't accumulate, and that follow-up NRC inspections should be operational rather than automatic.

I'm not sure what problem all these changes are supposed to be solving, but major changes like this could have significant unintended consequences.

One of the basic premises of the Reactor Oversight Process is that green and white findings can be leading indicators of larger, more safety-significant problems. Pilgrim is a textbook example of that.

Pilgrim was a Column 4 from September 2015 until earlier this month and it got there from three white findings. It didn't have any yellow or red findings but the white findings cause NRC to take a closer look at the performance at Pilgrim, and when

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

we looked more closely, our inspectors found major problems.

If the changes being discussed today had been made four years ago, Pilgrim wouldn't have even moved to Column 2, let alone Column 4. That clearly would have been the wrong safety outcome, and it highlights the risks of discounting the importance of white findings.

I want to mention one more proposed change to the Reactor Oversight Process. Currently, NRC maintains its own independent models referred to as SPAR models to evaluate the risk significance of findings at plants. These are separate from the licensee's probabilistic risk assessments.

Some stakeholders are arguing that NRC should discontinue its SPAR models and rely on the licensee's PRAs. I think this would be a mistake. The SPAR models are vital tools that enable independent decision-making by the regulator.

Not every licensee PRA would meet NRC's needs and the Agency's reliance on the PRAs would require NRC to play a much greater role in the development and maintenance of those models.

As risk information is used more and more by NRC and licensees, risk models become increasingly

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

critical. NRC experts need a set of models that they know inside and out, that they can modify to meet their specific regulatory needs, and that can provide analytical defense-in-depth in case there are flaws in licensee PRAs.

NRC's SPAR models have served these important purposes well over the years. I don't see the need for a big change to the SPAR models.

As we think about areas where the Agency has repeatedly struggled over the years and where significant changes may be warranted, I believe we should focus additional attention on two areas, the rulemaking process and the Agency's ability to quickly assess and understand the licensing basis of each nuclear power-plant.

During my time on the Commission, I've seen several rulemakings that have taken a decade or longer to complete. I think everyone agrees that this is far too long even for a complex rule.

Rulemaking is an important regulatory tool and we need to ensure that it is an effective tool at NRC. In some cases, we may use rulemaking to address a pressing safety or security problem.

In other cases a rule may be necessary to allow for greater technological innovation or new

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

approaches to longstanding regulatory issues. We should not allow unnecessarily protracted rulemakings to becoming an obstacle to getting the right standards in place.

In order to improve the timeliness of NRC rulemakings, I believe we should look at what processes, practices, and strategies have worked well at NRC and other federal regulatory agencies and which have not.

For example, we should assess whether targeted rulemakings focused on one or two regulatory changes proceed more smoothly than broad rulemakings that make many sometimes-unrelated changes to a regulation.

We should also assess whether all of the current steps in NRC's rulemaking process are appropriate for every rule. NRC's rulemaking process includes steps, it says, that draft regulatory basis and regulatory basis that other agencies' rulemaking processes do not.

For highly technical rules, these steps may add considerable value. For rules that are not technically complex, they may unnecessarily slow down the process.

Based on an evaluation of the factors and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

practices that have been shown to contribute to timely effective rulemakings and those that have not, we could decide whether we should make any changes to the rulemaking process.

To be a successful regulator, NRC also must be able to promptly access and understand the regulatory requirements applicable to each individual nuclear power-plant. A solid understanding of each plant's licensing basis is a prerequisite for effective oversight and enforcement.

However, because these requirements are often contained in voluminous microfiche documents that are decades old, this foundational regulatory step is too often a challenge for the Agency.

Digitization of licensing basis documents is underway and may assist in quickly locating records of license requirements, and the staff is looking at whether the task interface agreement process could be updated to provide more timely answers to questions from inspectors about the licensing basis of a plant.

But I believe we should perform a holistic review of how to enhance the Agency's capabilities in this area.

To do the best job for the American people, NRC needs to be open to new ideas and new

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

approaches but we also need to carefully and thoroughly evaluate proposed regulatory changes to ensure that they will have a positive impact on safety.

That's our core mission and must remain our top priority. Stakeholder feedback can help us to identify the ideas we should pursue and those we should not so please stay engaged.

I look forward to talking with many of you this week and in the future, and we also have some time for questions right now.

Thank you.

(Applause)

MR. FURSTENAU: As Commissioner Baran mentioned, time for a few questions. We had quite a few good ones come in and we'll try to get to as many as we can.

We talked about a rulemaking in your remarks. What do you see as the current rulemaking priorities for the Agency, your viewpoint on that?

COMMISSIONER BARAN: Sure.

We have several important rulemakings underway, some of which are currently before the Commission. For a while now we have been working on an important fuel cladding regulation, 50.46c for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

those who are really focus on these matters.

I think it's important because there's a safety issue that needs to be resolved in the rulemaking based on decades-long research project that show that some standards aren't as conservative as they should be, but also there's an important aspect of innovation there.

Moving to more performance-based standards, which is what this rulemaking would do for this area, is something that would be helpful in the review of new accident tolerant fuel and innovative fuel technologies. So I think that's an important rulemaking that serves a couple of key purposes.

There are others, I think the cybersecurity rulemaking for fuel cycle facilities is an important one. It's important to get that rule right and to get that proposed rule out for public comment.

We have the decommissioning rulemaking in front of us and that's a very detailed proposed rule that we're taking a look at, a lot of separate issues to consider there.

For me at least, we started initiating this rule back at the end of 2014 I guess. I always saw two important roles there for the rule. One was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

to move away from regulation by exemption in this area, I don't think it's efficient for anyone.

This rulemaking would be an opportunity to do that.

Another important function of this rule is really to take a fresh look at our program in this area, and this rule really gives us an opportunity to hear from a wide variety of stakeholders about what they think about a lot of the key issues, whether it's the role of states and local governments or nonprofit organizations, the timeframe around decommissioning, issues related to decommissioning trust funds.

There's a whole range of issues that decommissioning rulemaking will be looking at or that are being considered as part of that process. So I think that's another important rule.

I could go on, there are a number of key rulemaking matters that are either with us or on their way to us, and there's plenty to keep us busy for the foreseeable future.

MR. FURSTENAU: Okay, thank you. Here's a question that's on two ranges of Digital I&C. We had two different questions come in at different angles and I'll read them both and then you can take

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

on the questions.

The staff approach Digital I&C common cause failure in a zero-risk mentality, how can this be changed to be more pragmatic?

And then on the other side of the question, given the current questions following the Lion Air and Ethiopian Air plane crashes, the tragedy of that, do you have any reservations with moving too quickly on Digital I&C?

COMMISSIONER BARAN: Thank you for both those questions. I don't have a fear that we've been moving too quickly on it, that's not a particular problem we are confronting at this time.

But I think this goes back to common cause failures is one of the key issues. There are others that have been sticking points for the staff and for stakeholders over the years, how to resolve these issues.

And I talked about it a little bit in my remarks and we don't have time to go into a lot of detail on this but there are about I think five key documents, guidance documents, that the staff and stakeholders are at various stages of working through.

My hope is that, and when the Commission had a recent, relatively recent,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

Commission meeting on Digital Instrumentation and Control, I think there's a lot of hope that these guidance documents will really pave the way for striking that balance, having the right standards in place so that we're not taking risks we shouldn't take, that we are taking on acceptable risks, that safety will be ensured as it should, but also that we have a path forward for digital upgrades to go forward.

Because I think one of the things that's always amazed me about this issue of Digital Instrumentation and Control is, I think there is a widespread agreement that these technologies can enhance safety.

There are other benefits for operators of plants but there is a real ability to enhance safety, to get around a lot of the obsolescence issues that we have with analog.

And so I think we all want to get to that destination where you've got a predictable path to make the upgrades. I want to see whether we can get there on the guidance documents, and it may be that we can, and it may be that we can't.

It may be that we get a lot of the way there and we've got to assess what the gap is after

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

that. But as I mentioned in my remarks, I do worry that if we launch a new rulemaking effort today, tomorrow, next year, I don't want to take momentum away from the efforts there on getting the guidance documents in a good place.

And I think that is kind of the natural tendency. When you've got a big rulemaking that's going to get started and get going, people start focusing their attention there.

I think we should keep our eye on the ball, see how much we can accomplish with the guidance, and then do a gap analysis and figure out did we solve enough of the problem with the guidance, or is there so much more that it makes sense to do a rulemaking and perhaps look much more transformationally at this area?

MR. FURSTENAU: Thanks. Another question, how do you think more modern inspection technologies can reshape how the NRC regulates with the maintenance rule and how the industry implements the rule?

COMMISSIONER BARAN: I think this is not something I mentioned in the area of new technologies that could potentially challenge NRC's regulatory approach over the years, but I think it's a good one.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I know it's something that research is starting to look at, questions of big data and the analytics behind it and sensors and other things throughout a plant that could give a lot of information potentially to operators that right now maybe rely on human beings walking around and doing that work.

I'm pretty open-minded about that. I think we want to have the safety objectives and standards in place.

If folks out there are coming up with more innovative ways to do that, I'm not wedded to having human beings walking around the plant doing fire walks, for example, if there are better ways to do that.

So whenever we're looking at something like that, I think for us there are a couple things we need to do. One is what's a big part of your job, being ready for what's -- I don't know, if it's over the horizon or on the horizon or beside of the horizon at this point.

But we're looking and we're seeing we can expect folks to want to pursue those kinds of approaches in the next few years. We've got to be ready.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

What are the kinds of questions we would need to answer as regulators to have confidence that kind of technology could improve safety?

And then we also have to think through is there something about our actual licensing process or regulations that would potentially need to change if we were going to go in that direction?

And that's kind of a separate thing, but also, as I mentioned, can take a lot of time to work through the hard thinking about specific regulatory requirements or technical specifications or other things.

So we've got to start that kind of early, which is, again, an area where feedback from all of you is helpful because if you have a sense you're going to be heading in a direction, the sooner you let us know about it, the better because we want to be ready.

And we want to make sure that innovation aimed at improving safety is something that the Agency is ready for and can get behind. So, it's an important aspect of this.

MR. FURSTENAU: One last question for closing here.

Your remarks talked about transformation

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

but things that you haven't covered in your talk and in your questions, what priority work is in the face of the Commission right now from your viewpoint?

COMMISSIONER BARAN: Well, we actually have the transformation paper in front of us, we have the engineering inspections paper in front of us, we have several of these rulemakings we talked about earlier.

But as the first, I don't know if it's a panel, first group, the fireside chat talked about, when we talk about transformation and innovation, it isn't just one thing.

And there are aspects of it that I didn't talk about even this morning in terms of the Agency's human resources in our organization.

And there's a lot we've been doing to be smarter about strategic workforce planning, to be smarter about how we move people throughout the Agency to do work.

I think a lot of that is very important and can be very valuable, both for the Agency but also for the employees at the Agency who can use those as tools to chart their career path.

Something that came out of the first discussion that does have me worried and I do talk

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

about a lot is the lack of new hires we've had in recent years.

I think for the health of the organization, we're going to have to get back to doing new hires. When you hear a statistic that two percent, only two percent, of the people working at NRC are below 30, that is way too low.

And we're getting this kind of reverse pyramid where it's been so long since we've been bringing any kind of decent number of people into the Agency that we just don't have the new entrants.

And it's less about age and more better having new ideas, new talent come in the Agency. We've got to have that pipeline of new talent for a successful organization, whether you're at NRC or any other organization.

MR. FURSTENAU: Okay, thank you, Commissioner Baran.

COMMISSIONER BARAN: Thank you.

(Applause)

(Whereupon, the above-entitled matter went off the record at 10:07 a.m.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701