

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: April 04, 2014
Received: April 02, 2014
Status: Pending Post
Tracking No. 1jy-8bb3-irlw
Comments Due: April 04, 2014
Submission Type: Web

Docket: NRC-2013-0230
Fiscal Year 2014-2018 Strategic Plan

Comment On: NRC-2013-0230-0001
Draft Fiscal Years 2014-2018 Strategic Plan

Document: NRC-2013-0230-DRAFT-0010
Comment on FR Doc # 2014-04830

RECEIVED

2014 APR -4 AM 9:30

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
16-050

Submitter Information

Name: Steve Moniz
Address:
MI,

3/5/2014
79FR12531
11

General Comment

I appreciate this opportunity to comment on the NRC's future direction. In college I learned the value of strategic planning. However, there are some minor differences between what I see in your strategic plan and what I learned in Urban Planning 101 and from the Army. In particular, I feel you need to add the phrase "and promote" to your goal statement.

Urban Planning 101 teaches a three-tiered construct of a Goal, Policies that support the Goal, and Projects (where money is actually spent) that implement the Policies. The Army construct does not quite match this. They start with the commander's Vision. This is a vision of where the commander wants to take his unit. It has no restrictions. It is just a desired future. A military mission statement belongs to another construct, closer to operating expenses than investment funds. For the

*SUNSI Review Complete
Template - ADM-013*

*E-RDS = ADM-03
Add = R. Maum (R9b1)*

purposes here, I consider a mission statement and the strategic goal synonymous, as are policies and objectives.

There is only one strategic goal in the Urban Planning 101 framework. It has one positive thing to be achieved (the vision) and one negative thing to be avoided. The second part is important in that it provides balance - a dose of reality. Otherwise, the "goal" is unhindered by such mundane things as budgets or public opinion. For a government agency, such an unbalanced mission leads to abuse. The Federal Highway Administration and Corps of Engineers come to mind, literally bulldozing across the country. In contrast, the Federal Trade Commission regulates trade "with minimum disruption". The Federal Communication Commission "regulates and promotes" the use of the airwaves. (Note that in terms of the free market, the negative clause is first here.)

For a government agency, the positive clause in the strategic goal is generically "Promote the public welfare". The thing to be avoided is generally cost, so the strategic goal usually ends with "at minimum cost". ("At minimum risk" is another common qualifier.) A specific agency will have a more detailed positive clause. For the NRC, that section of the mission statement is "license and regulate the Nation's civilian use of radioactive materials to protect the public health and safety, promote the common defense and security, and protect the environment."

The current goal needs a balancing clause. As with the FCC, I would suggest "regulate and promote". You can easily justify the increased use of nuclear power for all three reasons given.

- 1) Nuclear is healthier and safer than the alternatives,
- 2) It promotes energy security,
- 3) It is better for the environment.

In the context of objectives that support the strategic goal, I would move licensing to the next level down. Licensing is a means to achieve the end (regulation), not a goal in itself. Similarly, the current goals, "ensure the safe use of radioactive materials and the secure use of radioactive materials", are policies/objectives.

I can't see the whole draft strategic plan, so I don't know your current set of policies/objectives. As a separate issue, I hope you have one that promotes the development of advanced nuclear concepts, such as the Gen IV initiative.

Again, my main point is to add the phrase "and promote" to your strategic goal. I don't know how much you can rephrase your goal/mission statement without an Act of Congress. But how hard can that be?