NYSERDA'S 131ST PROGRAM PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING
October 21, 2026
Clean Copy of Transcript

Audrey Zibelman:
Welcome, and I'm going to call the meeting to order. The notice and agenda for this meeting was provided to the Committee members on October 13th, 2026 and to the press on October 14, 2026. The meeting is being conducted in person and by video conference. I want to note, this is the Program Planning Committee of NYSERDA. To confirm that we have a forum, I would like to each of the Committee members to introduce themselves. I'll start. I'm Audrey Zibelman. I'm Chair of the Authority, and I'm going to be leading this meeting for Shere Abbott, who's Chair of the Committee. I'll just go around.

Jennifer Hensley:
Hi, everybody. Jen Hensley, Member of the Committee, Member of the Board.

JoAnne Hewett:
JoAnne Hewett, Member of the Committee, Member of the Board.

Lindsay Greene:
Lindsay Greene, Member of the Committee, Member of the Board.

Dale Bryk:
Dale Bryk Member of the Committee, Member of the Board.

Charles Bell:
Chuck Bell, Member of the Committee, Member of the Board.

Audrey Zibelman:
That's great. And I also would like to note that in addition to having a quorum that Shere Abbott is participating by video conference and per our extraordinary circumstances exception under the Open Meetings Law and our By-laws. Shere's participation will count for votes, but will not be included in the count four quorum. I think she's still here. Is that right? All right, good. Well then we'll just get started. The first item on the agenda is the approval of the minutes of the 130th Committee meeting held on April 29th, 2026. Let me start to see if there are any comments or changes people want for the minutes. Just move then. Can I have a motion approving the minutes?

Dale Bryk:
Second.

Audrey Zibelman:
Moved and seconded. Any opposition? Seeing none, the minutes have been approved. The next item on the agenda is the Committee Charter and pursuant to the Public Authorities Accountability Act of 2005, each of the Authority's Committees adopted Charter sets forth the Committee's responsibilities. One of the responsibilities is to periodically review the Charter and

determine what and if any amendments need to be made. These recommendations are then presented to the full Board for consideration and approval. A copy of the current Committee Charter was included in your meeting package. Our Counsel office regulatorily monitors relevant guidance from the Authority's Budget Office, the Comptroller's Office legislation and other Authority practices to determine whether to recommend any modifications. Other Authority's reviewed include the York Power Authority, Long Island Power Authority, the Dormitory Authority, and the Environmental Facilities Corporation. Currently, management is not recommending any changes to the Program Planning Charter. I want to first ask the Committee Member if there are any questions or suggestions for changes to the Charter.

Lindsay Greene:
No.

Audrey Zibelman:
Seeing none, may I have a motion recommending approval of the Program Planning Committee Charter?

Dale Bryk:
Moved.

Audrey Zibelman:
Second. Okay. I'll seeing motion approve. Any opposition? Seeing none, the Committee's Charter has been recommended for approval. The next item on the agenda then concerns are advanced nuclear activities. This will include a report of the NYSERDA's Advanced Nuclear Activities. John Williams, our Chief Policy Officer, will be introducing this item before turning it to the Director of Strategy, Erich Scherer is here today, and Policy and Regulatory Affairs Associate Director Alyse Peterson. Let me first turn it to John.

John Williams:
Thank you, Audrey. And I'm just going to briefly just note that part of what we're thinking about with this advanced nuclear advancing the Governor's stated policies here is to look at what it's going to take for New York State to actually make investments in these new technologies and to ensure that as we're advancing with these technologies, they're meeting all of the state's standards and requirements in terms of siting and local community agreement and wanting to make sure that all parties are fully informed of what it will take to bring some of these new technologies to bear. So Eric is going to speak a little bit to some work that was recently produced, looking at the numbers side of the equation I'll say. And Alyse Peterson from our Nuclear Coordination offices will speak to some of the engagement efforts that NYSERDA will be putting forward as we see new projects come into the fall. So we'll start with Erich.

Erich Scherer:
Thank you very much John and good afternoon Committee and Board members. It's my pleasure to offer you an update on almost numbers, so I will get into the numbers in a moment, but as first I will connect to John's introduction and provide a little bit more overview. I will also note that I believe the last time I had the opportunity to speak with you was early last year, so it's been a little while. And so again, a good opportunity to provide an update. And if I just make the

connection between early last year and where we are now, the first thing that comes to mind is that early last year was when we, as NYSERDA had just been instructed by the Governor to develop an Advanced Nuclear Master Plan for New York. And so looking now where we are right now, the master plan is due by the end of this year.

So right now we are getting into final sprint mode, if I can put it that way, to complete that master plan. If we can turn to the first slide please, I will say a little bit more about the work on the master plan towards the end of this presentation. But again, noting at the bottom of this slide already the emphasis on NYSERDA's work on that master plan together with DPS. If from that I zoom out a little bit more, then I will also emphasize that of course there have been a number of important steps again between last year and now. And most visibly, I would say probably at the top of the slide here, of course the announcement by Governor Hochul that New York will goal of effectively five gigawatt of new advanced nuclear. And the announcement of that goal I also want to mention fell within the context of wider analysis that NYSERDA has done in particular on the State's Energy Plan.

As you're all aware, we published the updated State Energy Plan in December last year. I'll also talk a little bit more about that analysis towards the end of this presentation, but noting that that provided an important bit of quantitative underpinning, explaining, making the case why advanced nuclear inclusion of advanced nuclear makes a number of five gigawatts makes sense. And so that five gigawatt also to note falls within the broader context of the nuclear generation force we still have in the state already, which is 3.4 gigawatts, so adding up to a total backbone goal of 8.4 gigawatts. The Governor also tasked DPS and the Public Service Commission with pursuing that goal. And so that led earlier this summer in June to the PSE adopting its initiating order. And that June point in time is also important for our conversation here because that's where I will get into also the document that we published together with staff at the same time in June, which is the advanced nuclear options paper.

That's where the numbers live and I'll get to those again in a moment. Finally on this slide to emphasize that when we are talking about this context of developing a policy framework for New York through the master plan, then at the same time it's also important to recognize that we are not waiting for that master plan to complete in order to take action. And so that was another key announcement instruction from Governor Hochul to NYPA to already proceed with the development of a project of at least one gigawatt. So that's underway. And of course I also want to note that most recently that we also had the positive news of Fort Drum being awarded one of the slots in the federal program for micro generation. So effectively we have two projects underway now. So with that context in mind, I'll move to the next slide please and indeed pivot to, as I mentioned a moment ago, the options paper.

So again, produced and published together with the backbone initiating order in June. And important to flag that we intentionally concluded that it's important to start with one component of the master plan. So the options paper is basically the document that examines commercial viability of advanced nuclear deployment. And so commercial viability is a key component in our overall consideration of what it takes to advance new nuclear. And the master plan as such is the framework within which we explore all those different perspectives, including commercial

The meeting transcript was created with the assistance of an Artificial Intelligence (AI) transcription tool.

viability. But on that topic of commercial viability, we already published that initial deliverable in the form of the options paper.

I'll also note that options paper was subject as part of the PSC backbone proceeding to public comment. That commentary closed in September. So we already have a good body of public and stakeholder feedback on the topics in paper. And that will allow DPS together with ourselves to work on a follow-up white paper that will then move us from the approach in the option paper as the title of that document suggests it's really presenting options, but it's not decisional, but the next step is for the white paper to get to a point of recommendations that would then be actionable by the public service function. But what is actually in the options paper, so that gets us to the bottom half of this slide. On the left hand, but primarily or initially a qualitative assessment of the various intervention options that state could employ to, as I said, overcome barriers to commercial viability.

And both that assessment takes place both as such option by option, and I'll talk a bit more about that in a moment, but then also extends that consideration from say an individual that might need assistance to thinking about the broader pipeline approach for the five gigawatts and not individual projects, but how they add up to deploying five gigawatt overall. So pipeline dynamics. And then on the right-hand side, on the bottom right, to note that this options paper, I think it's fair to say, is really quite detailed. It has a thorough both qualitative examination, but then backed up also by a lot of analysis. Analysis both as regards economic impacts, but then very importantly also detailed cost analysis as well as an assessment of lessons that we can take away from the.

And so with that in mind, if we can go to the next slide, then I will take us through a summary of the policy options considered in the paper. And this is where I would have the opportunity to speak to you for as long and in as much detail as you would be interested in hearing about on this slide. I'm trying to provide it in a summarized form, but feel free to interrupt me or indicate if there's anything that you would like more detail on. But so in a nutshell, the paper starts with an assessment of the barriers. And again, these are barriers to commercial viability, noting that there are of course other issues that need to be considered in the broader spectrum within the master plan, but this is through the lens of commercial viability and really dissecting that into the project stages. So in the top list, noting that the first stage is pre - FIDs or pre-final investment decision where parties don't even know whether there is going to be a project.

So from the perspective of barriers, there is certainly a significant risk level there. And then when you get to the next stage, when actual development construction starts as of FID, again, key questions around risk. And so at that stage of development of the project, the key risk is around construction and potential for cost overruns such as we've certainly seen for some past projects. And then finally on the top right, when you get to operation of these projects, the key commercial barrier or question is whether market revenues suffice to make this project commercial viable. And so that recognition of these different barriers at different stages also drives a consideration of what options for stage intervention we can consider. And so if I again go through those at the bottom from left to right, for that pre - FID stage, noting that even though that's just an initial stage, there are still significant amounts of money involved in those initial stages.

The meeting transcript was created with the assistance of an Artificial Intelligence (AI) transcription tool.

So there's certainly a question whether perhaps more traditionally the stage would get involved in co-funding. An example that we've already seen recently is our co-funding for early site permit activities for possible constellation project. So that's certainly the question that the option paper asks, but it also notes that, again, where I said the risk around the pre - FID stage is because stakeholders don't really know whether there is a project forward. Well, part of reducing that risk could be to provide more clarity for what the broad policy framework looks like. So the sooner we can get to clarity on what effectively the offering is from New York State, that could certainly also help overcome pre - FID challenges. Moving to the middle of the slide and the barrier of construction risk, there we get into what is certainly being very visibly, very much a frequent point of discussion, the question of hostile run risk and the extent to which government should be involved in overcoming that risk.

Again, the options paper is not decisional options, but at the same time it provides some important insights in terms of how this kind of risk does not lend itself to being allocated to any single party. We've seen examples in the past where government might take on effectively all of that risk. We've seen in the past where individual project developers take on all of that risk and none of those cases that turns out to be an ideal outcome. So the key point the options paper considers is a more nuanced approach where the whole range of parties should arguably participate in overcoming that risk. So starting with developers, but also private sector funders, EPC providers, technology providers, takers, potentially insurance companies. And then when you look at that whole spectrum of parties, there's still the question whether there's also all required for government. And so again, the analysis that we'll talk about in a moment gives an indication of what benefit might be from state participation in that approach.

JoAnne Hewett:
Yes. At what stage here in this chart do the developers or the private companies get involved? Are they involved in the early development or do they come in?

Erich Scherer:
Well, first of all, it depends what you mean by developer. It's a rather nebulous firm in its own right. So if I tried to summarize the stages at the very earliest stages, even an open question who initially develops the interest in the project, it's certainly typically a private sector party. Also in the past it's been the utility, but also going forward, it could be a community itself. And so then you will have an incremental process of defining that interest more, identifying candidate sides, doing incremental work to assess those sites. And again, it can be horses for horses which party takes the lead at that stage. And that party will then also have to find funders. So then different types of funders are coming on board. I don't know whether there's any kind of subtakes whether what you would like me to pursue.

JoAnne Hewett:
Thank you.

Erich Scherer:
And of course that becomes a lot clear once you get to the FID because that's the point where everyone commits and you have that whole complex of parties needing to come together and everyone's role gets defined.

The meeting transcript was created with the assistance of an Artificial Intelligence (AI) transcription tool.

JoAnne Hewett:
But it seems that the earlier they get involved, the better for everyone.

Erich Scherer:
So it's definitely better for everyone is if as early as possible, it's clear where the funding also needs to come from this stage. And you might be talking for a gigawatt size project at 200, $300 million. That's not an inconsequential amount of money in the FID.

Audrey Zibelman:
When you think about that then in terms of the early development risks, isn't that a little bit then dependent on how we structure the procurement and what the state's role? I mean, there would be one, because I would think that your early development risk is going to be dependent on whether or not you do a broad procurement where you have multiple players at different locations versus a much more narrow procurement where the state could be very clear about where it wants the nuclear to go and even clear about the technology it wants to see. And then that would reduce some of the pre - FID uncertainty. So it's all intertwined, right?

Erich Scherer:
That's exactly right. And you put it much better than I did, but that's exactly what we're trying to capture in recognizing yes, there can be hands-on intervention at the early stage, but some of it is indeed, as you say, also about providing clarity on what actually happens later on in the process and providing service.

Audrey Zibelman:
So when you're working with the department, it'd be interesting to see how much the state is able to say, look, with even non-cash actions, we can reduce risk and therefore reduce increased certainty.

Erich Scherer:
And indeed –

Audrey Zibelman:
And that there's a trade-off, right? Everyone wants to be technology neutral, but on the other hand, that creates new uncertainty.

Erich Scherer:
And there is a whole spectrum of actions. As you said, technology selection is one of them. And of course, NYPA is in that process right now, but it's also the various broader areas that we're covering in the master plan, what is the state workforce, supply chain, what have you. These are all risks that are on stakeholders minds as well.

Audrey Zibelman:
So do you anticipate when you give the master plan recommendations, you'll be able to be in a position to identify the trade-offs?

The meeting transcript was created with the assistance of an Artificial Intelligence (AI) transcription tool.

Erich Scherer:
I will understandably hopefully be hesitant in the extent to which I would want to indicate what is going to happen in the next 10, which is the right page for publication. But that will definitely need to try and get from that assessment of options towards, as I said, recommendations. Yes.

Lindsay Greene:
Yeah. I was going to have a question. I guess where in the report, maybe it's related to this support, but the idea that the supports needed to encourage first of a kind technologies would be different most likely because the risk is so much higher for those. But if you're to Arja's point about not trying to be technology neutral, but recognizing that established technologies that have waste issues and things of that nature versus SMRs or some of the far off, maybe it's not far off, fusion people, they need something different and there's a degree of leaning into them to encourage those that require a different type of resources.

Audrey Zibelman:
JoAnne would say they would need two decades and they always need two decades.

Erich Scherer:
Talk about fusion now. Yes. If you don't mind holding that question a couple of slides down because we attempt to explore those dynamics in some details if I may come back.

Audrey Zibelman:
Any other questions this way? We can go ahead.

Erich Scherer:
Thanks. Great.

Audrey Zibelman:
I forgot.

Erich Scherer:
So then we'll round out on this slide by noting probably the most straightforward point if we're thinking about possible state interventions on the right-hand side, the possibility of a ANZECs type structure. So something linked to revenue is of course something that where we do have significant experience both through ANZECs for existing nuclear as well as ANZECs for renewables. As a placeholder name, if you will, we are referring to them here as advanced nuclear zero emission credits or index. But for that mechanism, a key dynamic that the options paper recognizes is that arguably the nuclear things are different because we have a very visible dynamic around especially hyperscaler and data center off-takers team to partner with nuclear, but also indicating a willingness to pay above market revenue levels. And so I mean conceptually that opportunity find an above market offtake, of course it gets for all resources, but it's very prominent for nuclear in the discussion at the moment.

And so that balance to consider that potentially attractive opportunity versus on the other hand, also challenges that may be involved with including.

The meeting transcript was created with the assistance of an Artificial Intelligence (AI) transcription tool.

And then finally in the option spectrum, one of that is arguably already on the radar because again, we have the NYPA project ongoing. It's the question of a state or state-like type of equity investment. Again, for the NYPA project, that's all clearly a question that NYPA will need to ask itself what the nature of its involvement will be. But in this analysis, the observation is that if we were to pursue state equity, and it could be NYPA or another party, then that potentially offers the opportunity that that source of funding could be at a lower cost to the project than private sector equity capital. And when we look at the numbers in the moment, we will see how that cost of equity perhaps unsurprisingly is really a key.

Audrey Zibelman:
It's part of that. I mean, I would think when I was... The issue with nuclear has always been the risk of the subsequent government disapproval because it takes so long. I would imagine that when you're looking at the state equity, it does become a value proposition in terms of reducing forward looking risk because the government essentially is reduced sovereign risk.

Erich Scherer:
That's exactly right. It's whichever basket of risks you would care to mention that is on the funder's minds and how they price it. When you go to the private sector, you will get their pricing. If it's public funds, it's more about effectively a choice.

Audrey Zibelman:
Yeah.

Erich Scherer:
Okay, so then looks like we can move on to next slide please. Here are along the way to numbers. So again, I mentioned earlier the options paper provides cost analysis and it does so on the basis of a wide range of scenarios with the objective to explore dynamics, how the cost differ depending on the approach there. And so there's no attempt, certainly not on this one slide to provide you with a comprehensive overview. If numbers are of interest, I would encourage you to take a look at the detail in the options paper. But just as an overview, I will note first of all on the left-hand side that we examine different types of projects. And so this is one aspect where we already get into the question of technology selection. So here we are assessing on the one hand large scale reactors like the 81000 versus on the other hand SMR, small modular reactors.

And on the other hand, also the nature of the site. Are we talking about a greenfield or a brownfield site, which also has cost implications? But just within the range then of those kinds of use cases, if you will, that's then where we get into assessment, what are the difference between different policy approaches? And so I will draw attention just to the second use case here, the large night water reactor brownfield. Again, the number of scenarios here is by no means exhaustive, but to illustrate the approach, we're starting with analysis where we're saying, what if the state were to do nothing? And then picking up again on the point of risk that we talked about a moment ago and said, so therefore would look to private sector parties, private sector funders in particular to fully take on that risk at their elevate hurdle rates. Then if you look at the first column of numbers, that's the cost of the project at completion.

The meeting transcript was created with the assistance of an Artificial Intelligence (AI) transcription tool.

If you just have in the back of your mind that just the overnight capital cost of a gigawatt size project is around $10, $12 billion thereabouts, and then you see that here shown it's $19 billion, it just shows you the impact of a high cost of finance. Really important point to keep in mind. And then conversely, if we look at the role below that at the first, if you will, scenario with state action and the acronym the COG cost over and guarantee. So with the assumption that the state would take a slice off a certain nature of risk and consequently be able to reduce private sector funder hurdle rates, you can see what a big impact that can make in terms of reducing that include finance cost and the overall project cost. And so then those project costs also translate to what is the revenue requirement for these projects and therefore by extension what might be the need for any analytic type support.

And so you can similarly see how those numbers go down. And then in the third row, just to add one more illustrative option, as I mentioned, possibility of cheaper state equity. Again, if you add that to the mix, it helps to reduce project costs and support. I'm getting a note that I need to hurry up.

Audrey Zibelman:
You're doing fine. The members keep interrupting you. Go ahead.

Erich Scherer:
I will keep us going to the next slide, please. I think this is the last slide where I might be a bit lengthy. So if we can go to the next slide please, then that's the slide where we can pick up on those pipeline and technology dynamics. Again, I will merely attempt to give you an overview here and noting some of the dynamics that we're exploring here. So if we start with the visual bit on the right in blue, large light worker reactors in orange SMRs. So indicating that where we are assessing and indeed modeling these different ways of delivering five gigawatts, then the first question is indeed what would the technology choice be? Once again, the option paper doesn't opine on that, but it tests scenarios with large light water reactors versus SMRs. And then the first scenarios are what if we just pick one of those technologies and run with it for a full five gigawatt?

But then that leads us into follow-up scenarios to where we're saying, well, we could technology side by side. In terms of speed to power, that would give you an advantage clearly. But then we could also think in scenario three, we could also do different technology sequential. And so in scenario three, we introduce a concept of a review moment pathway, if you will, where we would pause and say in scenario 3A, either conclude that the technology that we started out with is great and we would just keep going with it or conclude that there might be a new, different, more attractive opportunity and switch to another technology. And then finally, the scenario at the bottom is to note that all of the other scenarios do really incorporate that pipeline dynamic. And I want to just recap, the key point when I'm talking about pipeline dynamic is around cost production.

I should have made that point probably earlier, but to emphasize that all of the experience that we can look at, not just in nuclear, but in other technologies as well, of course confirms that if you go and repeat, then that unlocks learning effects and pulse productions. And so again, that's a key characteristic that drives how we set up these scenarios. But in the last scenario we do

The meeting transcript was created with the assistance of an Artificial Intelligence (AI) transcription tool.

recognize you could of course also take a more project by project approach where you wouldn't insist in the procurement mechanics that there is an extensive pipeline in one go. Again, probably all I can do right now is set the scene in terms of the type of scenarios we're exploring both on the progression through the five gigawatts and the technology selection. And then very briefly maybe just point to a couple of interesting points in the numbers that you see there as well, noting at the top of the slide, if we just look at the price at COD as an indicator that if you do a single technology pipeline, it's a relatively low cost because again, you maximize those learning effects.

If you look at the bottom of the slide, project by project, it's a relatively high cost because again, you don't have as many learning effects. And then in the other scenarios, it's more nuanced outside. I will just point out scenario two is interesting because it's a relatively high cost. It does get you the most gigawatts the most quickly. That's a key advantage there, but you're also working on multiple technologies at the development point where they are at their most expensive RDV. But at the same time that also getting more gigawatts on the grid also unlocks more system benefits more quickly. So it's a balancing act. And finally, perhaps pointing to scenario 3B as an interesting observation. So where I said 3B is where you give yourself the opportunity to do a review, figure out whether you switch technology. 3B characterizes the possibility where it makes sense to switch to a different technology.

And this recognizes the key point in the analysis that we have to admit that the actual cost of these technology is still uncertain. And so as we build experience, we will get more certainty on the cost. And if it then turns out that especially one of these new SMI technologies is actually a table to achieve a cost breakthrough compared to our mid-range cost. So in that scenario 3B, we are testing a what if scenario. What if the SMR does progress at the bottom end of its cost curve and we are able a few years down the line to recognize that then you see in the projections here that unsurprisingly.

Audrey Zibelman:
Any questions? I just have one. This is a really fascinating way to look at it, but I would imagine that the learning curve also could be learning curve just in the industry itself through deployments that doesn't have to be New York. And then secondly, there's, as you say, a value of time because you get more information, but also I would imagine there's a value too to maintain a fit of dry powder simply because we just don't know what supply chains are going to look like. And if everyone's doing this, we may find prices of a particular technology increased.

Erich Scherer:
Entirely right. And if I may, sorry, you're giving me the opportunity there to just do a little bit of bragging on your first point because the nuances that you just hinted at there within learning cost reduction are exactly what we're on our mind. And if you look at any other analysis, it just takes a standard learning rate and runs with it. Under the hood in this analysis, we really dissected that. We said, what's the bit of learning that we can realize on a single site? What's the bit of learning that we can realize in New York? What's the bit of learning that might occur out of state and the extent to which we could import it? So that's really where our analysis I would put it to is pushing the boundaries and enabling us to add that nuance. And on your second point, we fully

The meeting transcript was created with the assistance of an Artificial Intelligence (AI) transcription tool.

agree the auction paper also recognizes this key point that you just made under the heading of maintaining optionality.

Audrey Zibelman:
Thank you for that. Any further questions? So we now move on, right?

Erich Scherer:
I have two more slides.

Audrey Zibelman:
Oh, you do? So you're on your last slide. Sorry. The promise was this was the last name of the slide.

Erich Scherer:
Do give me the hook if I'm overstepping your mind. So yes, if we can go to the next slide. Just really to emphasize the range of the quantitative analysis that we're offering here. Very quickly at the top, this is the potential program cost analysis that we just talked through. In the red circle on the left, I mentioned at the beginning state energy plan analysis on system benefits. So key finding there again circled in red here that in that state energy plan analysis where we're comparing scenarios with and without nuclear, the scenarios with nuclear are locked net system benefits of around about 50 billion by 2050. So really big numbers. And then in the bottom left also to note that separately we're also offering economic impact analysis. So what's the benefit locally and statewide in terms of jobs, taxes, supply chain, et cetera.

So with that, very briefly just to the last slide to close the loop. And again, reminding us that as our next step here, we have the completion of the wider master plan on our radar. And again, noting that that encompasses a much wide range issues and be on the lookout please for updates in that regard at our upcoming advanced nuclear summit on the 18th of November in August.

Audrey Zibelman:
All right. Thank you. And now we have Alyse.

John Williams:
Yeah, we can do Alyse. Alyse, are you there?

Alyse Peterson:
I am. Hopefully everyone can see me. I don't see my slides up on the screen yet.

Dale Bryk:
We see them.

Alyse Peterson:
You do. Ah, there we are. Okay. Well, good afternoon. I am Alyse Peterson. Despite longtime service at NYSERDA, this is the first time that I have presented to this Committee and I am very much pleased to be here. For those of you who also serve on the Waste and Facilities Management Committee, much of what I relay today may have a familiar ring. For the rest of

you, it may be somewhat new. So over the next 10 minutes, I'd like to introduce you to the Nuclear Coordination Office or NCO. I will focus on what the Nuclear Coordination Office is, the government-wide role that we play, our first new development project at Fort Drum, ongoing federal engagement, and how we're staffing our work. Next slide please.

Okay, so this is not a brand new program. This is a renaming of a statutory coordination and policy function that NYSERDA has carried out for decades. The new name recognizes, however, the future directions of NYSERDA's longstanding nuclear coordination work, which is now taking on more visibility as New York advances responsible new nuclear development. The office sits within NYSERDA's policy portfolio and reports directly to the chief policy officer. So alongside the coordination that we provide, we also inform nuclear power and radioactive waste policy. We generate new ideas and initiatives and advise executive and program staff. So really what is the NCO? The NCO is New York's longstanding coordinating and policy point of contact for nuclear power, radioactive waste, and other atomic energy activities. We're a central trusted focal point that keeps tabs on existing facilities and helps responsible new projects advance. It's important to remember that the NCO is indeed a rebrand and an elevation of work that we have long done. This is not a new bureaucracy in any way. We coordinate, inform, and facilitate, but we do not regulate. Next slide please.

The role is one that NYSERDA has held and honed for decades. As I said earlier, it gives the office real standing across state government and is known and respected outside New York as well. By statute, we coordinate the programs of the state and its subdivisions that affect atomic energy activities. We advise and assist the Governor in development and implementation and also correlate those programs with programs of federal partners and with the programs of other states. This means coordination at every level of government. The NCO is a resource for local governments directly and also for our NYSERDA colleagues who engage with communities. At the state level, we work with an inter-agency team, a core group of state agencies that each bring their own complimentary nuclear and radiological experience that are fostered within their agency's responsibilities. One cornerstone of this very broad role that I've described is that NYSERDA is New York's NRC State Liaison Officer.

The NRC created the State Liaison Officer program way back in 1976, and NYSERDA has served in that role since that time, or NYSERDA's predecessors of course. The SLO is the primary two-way channel between the state and the federal regulator, as well as a key advisor to the Governor's office. It serves as a model for engagement with DOE and the Department of War as those entities are going to take on greater roles in new nuclear development as well. The NCO looks beyond our borders. We correlate New York's programs with peer states through the National Association of State and Energy Officials, excuse me, State Energy Officials, NASEO, and our state liaison officer connections. Each state, all 50 of them have a state liaison officer, which means we have 49 friends out there we can reach out to at any time. Interstate engagement allows us to share lessons and to speak with a more informed voice. Next slide please.

Coordination runs in multiple directions, and I'd like to highlight both the service we provide and the work we drive ourselves. For developers and communities, we are a first point of contact and a single point of information for navigating federal, state, and local processes. For our own NYSERDA program and executive staff, we are an in-house expert resource that helps

colleagues plan and act on sound current information. And for our sibling state agencies and their leaders, we provide trusted information and advice on atomic energy matters at the state and federal level. But the office is not only reactive, we do track technology. We track happenings in the nuclear industry and the lessons learned from those happenings, and we contribute to new ideas and initiatives that move New York's nuclear agenda forward. Underneath all of this, we maintain a shared information base, translating the technology, the policy, and the lessons learned into clear guidance and action for every one of those audiences at every level. Next slide.

Okay, so earlier I mentioned recognizing future directions as new nuclear development emerges. Well, we're having some emerge. In August 2026, the US Army selected Fort Drum in Jefferson County as one of five installations to host microreactor projects under its Janus program. When built, this will likely be the first new reactor constructed in New York since the 1980s. This is a federal defense-led project on army land and regulation will be by the army rather than the NRC as is done for commercial plants. So we will be coordinating on the state side. We will also engage directly with the US Army's nuclear regulatory office to advocate for the state's interests. We will model that on the way we engage with NRC, but it will be directly with the army. And also along the way, we will capture lessons learned that will help inform and serve the commercial projects that we anticipate to follow. Next slide.

Okay. Alongside all of that new project work, our traditional coordination role not only continues, but it is intensified. Driven by the Federal Advance Act and Executive Order 14-300, the NRC is undertaking a wholesale revision of its regulations, roughly two dozen rulemakings in about a year, which is an extraordinary pace for that agency. As the state's nuclear coordinator and state liaison officer, we have led New York's review of those rulemakings and have commented on most of them. This has been one of the more significant undertakings this office has carried over the past year. Our flagship comment packages span the areas that matter most to a host state, environmental review, radiation protection, licensing, safety oversight, the new microreactor framework, and emerging technologies like fusion. Across all of them, our posture is consistent. We're broadly supportive of a faster and risk-informed federal framework while still protecting state oversight, environmental review, public participation and safety.

As an example, one proposed rulemaking alters the way the NRC handles NYPA reviews, that's the National Environmental Policy Act. The proposed rulemaking would expand categorical exclusions, narrow the scope of NRC environmental reviews, and eliminate environmental impact statement scoping and the issuance of draft statements for public comment. These changes when taken together would result in reduced public participation in the federal environmental review process and also result in less environmental information available for NRC and other decision makers. Next slide, please.

Given the expanding workload, I do want to note that we have expanded the team. We brought on a new advisor on Board the coordination office about two months ago. The immediate practical impact is capacity, supporting me as we advance initiatives, respond to NYSERDA program and agency needs, engaging on emerging development, excuse me, and staying engaged in the federal arena and with other states all at the same time. It is also worth placing the office in the bigger picture. The options paper and the forthcoming master plan will set the strategy and policy direction. You can think of the NCO as kind of an operational hand that will help turn that

The meeting transcript was created with the assistance of an Artificial Intelligence (AI) transcription tool.

strategy into real projects on the ground. And we are looking ahead. Fort Drum is a federal defined case, but the private commercial development that follows will be broader and busier, and the office is being built to scale up with that. And final slide, please.

Let me close with three takeaways. First, the NCO is a familiar function, but it's reinforced for what is to come. Longstanding coordination and nuclear policy work is now set up as a visible office and a clear central contact for both industry and our own staff, as well as communities and the public. Second, we have a real first project in Fort Drum that will approve this model with broader private development ahead. And third, we are ready and connected for robust engagement, our staff capacity, longtime statutory state role, our state liaison officer designation, and our active federal engagement all combined to position New York to lead responsibly. I'd like to thank you for your time and your support, and I'm happy to take questions in the few minutes we have left. Thank you.

Audrey Zibelman:
Thanks, Alyse. And knowing that we have Board meetings starting in four minutes, why don't we first see if there's any questions for Alyse? That was really helpful and welcome to the Board or the planning Committee. Any questions from the Committee members? No. All right. Well, that was good and good luck on your work. Thank you very much.

Alyse Peterson:
Thank you.

Audrey Zibelman:
John, is there anything else to cover?

John Williams:
Yeah. Nope, that was it.

Audrey Zibelman:
Good, good. All right. Then we're really done except for other business. Is there any other business to come under the Committee today? I see none. Can I have a motion to adjourn?

Charles Bell:
So moved.

Lindsay Greene:
Second.

Audrey Zibelman:
And seconded. No opposition. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you very much all.

The meeting transcript was created with the assistance of an Artificial Intelligence (AI) transcription tool.