

Workforce Supply Chain Technical Working Group (WSC-TWG)

Supply Chain Subcommittee Meeting #1

May 14, 2026; 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m. ET

Discussion Summary

Introduction

- The facilitator from Eastern Research Group (ERG) welcomed subcommittee members, introduced the project team, and reviewed the rules and agenda.
- Subcommittee members introduced themselves in the chat.

Why the Supply Chain Subcommittee Matters

- Staff from the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority (NYSERDA) explained that the goal of the TWG is to identify what should be confirmed, corrected, added, or evaluated before the next phase of the study.
 - Where can New York State move from its existing nuclear experience and capacity to nuclear-ready supply chain advantage?
- The Subcommittee can help separate near-term and long-term goals and strategies. Subcommittee members should share their thoughts on any methodology concerns, missing stakeholders, and priority levels.

Supply Chain Methodology

- BW Research (BW) provided an overview of the methodology for the Supply Chain Study. The Advanced Nuclear Master Plan will help New York understand the current supply chain, identify future opportunities, and build a localization strategy.
- The study assesses the supply chain of four nuclear reactor technologies: large light water reactors, small light water reactors, sodium-cooled fast reactors, and high-temperature gas-cooled reactors. Light water and non-light water reactors have different supply chain challenges.
- Subcommittee member feedback:
 - In a polling question, members were asked if the four reactor types could represent the advanced nuclear supply-chain range.
 - Five subcommittee members said yes, zero said no, and four said they were not sure.
 - One subcommittee member said New York State is expected to have commercial advanced nuclear energy by 2030 or 2040.
 - Another subcommittee member noted that because lead-cooled fast reactors have some similarities to sodium-cooled fast reactors and high-temperature gas-cooled reactors, they are covered by the sample of the proposed four reactors.

Disassembled Schematics and Supply Chain Mapping

- BW explained that the draft study maps New York State’s existing strengths for nuclear and nuclear-adjacent firms by identifying all components needed for each of the four reactor types and linking those components firms in New York State via their North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) codes. The study also looks at how timelines differ across component technologies.
- Subcommittee member feedback:
 - The study should look at prioritizing state procurement of components that will be needed for future advanced nuclear facilities. A member suggested that the study look at whether nuclear procurement firms are locally sourcing parts or sourcing parts from other states.
 - Another member raised that for some firms meeting Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) and domestic content requirements at a national level is a current priority.
 - In a polling question, subcommittee members were presented with several supply chain components and asked which are realistic for supply chain localization, expansion, or retention and which should be de-prioritized.
 - Overall, subcommittee members said pump components and valve components were the most realistic, followed by heat exchangers and then grid transformers. Subcommittee members voted that turbine sets, steam generators, and large/ultra-large forgings are the best candidates to be de-prioritized.
 - One subcommittee member said large/ultra-large forgings need more capacity, but there were no geographic constraints. A large/ultra-large forge doesn’t need to be close to a factory.
 - One subcommittee member said that in the near-term, developers may need to rely on national supply chains, because developing state-level supply chains will require time (i.e., due to the process and timelines needed for qualification).
 - A subcommittee member said they didn’t think there were any components that needed to be sourced in-state.
 - Another subcommittee member suggested that there could be opportunities for U.S.–Canadian partnerships around nuclear supply.

Supply Chain Barriers

- A survey of nuclear or nuclear-adjacent firms in New York State identified workforce experience and certifications as the main obstacles for firms to act as suppliers to the nuclear industry. Manufacturers also brought up the need for facility expansion.
- Subcommittee member feedback:
 - One subcommittee member suggested that engineering, procurement, and construction (EPC) firms be similarly surveyed.
- Another subcommittee member brought up power transmission as a challenge since large supply chain companies may have high power demands.

- ERG introduced a MURAL board on which members added to a pre-populated list of barriers to supply chain localization; noted if those barriers could be influenced by New York State agencies (directly, indirectly, or not at all); and added notes to provide ideas of how those agencies could influence the barriers.
- Subcommittee MURAL responses:
 - Obstacles NYSERDA or state agencies can directly influence include project demand signals, regulatory guidelines, site readiness framework, nuclear knowledge among nuclear-adjacent firms, high labor costs and requirements, shortage of qualified workers, certification, the high cost to enter the market, and difficulty in attracting certain industries.
 - The following are specific comments from subcommittee members and state staff who participated:
 - **Project demand signals.** There is a need for clear and transparent project timelines and access to subject matter experts to provide up-to-date information on market status. NYSERDA should create subject matter groups to support the industry.
 - **Clear regulatory guidelines.** NYSERDA should include regulatory agencies in permitting reviews and delineate responsibilities between local, state, and federal government agencies. State agencies should adopt federal guidelines without any extra New York State regulations.
 - **Site readiness framework.** State agencies should continue to fund programs like FAST and Power Up and expand into site development grants. State agencies should continue incentives to redevelop brownfields with existing infrastructure.
 - **Nuclear knowledge among nuclear-adjacent firms.** State agencies could sponsor industry events and conferences, as well as offer webinars, outreach, and one-to-one guidance. They should also have events focused on specific types of stakeholders.
 - **High labor costs and requirements.** NYSERDA should expand On-the-Job Training programming and streamline the enrollment process. Wage mandates are an industry deterrent.
 - **Shortage of qualified workers.** The state should offer training through New York State BOCES schools and partner with community colleges.
 - **Certification.** State agencies should help firms navigate certification and should support certification development.
 - **High cost to enter market.** NYSERDA could provide seed funding for manufacturers and support businesses to network with state agencies. NYSERDA should also focus on growing existing state companies and consider adding procurement requirements for in-state manufacturing.
 - **Difficulty in attracting certain industries.** State agencies should prioritize high-road employers to show a desire to build a sustainable industry. State

agencies should also look at what other states are doing to promote nuclear adoption.

- Obstacles NYSERDA or state agencies can indirectly influence include long lead times and changing administration priorities, local government acceptance, off-take challenges, and transportation.
 - The following are specific comments from subcommittee members and state staff who participated:
 - **Long lead times and changing administration priorities.** State agencies need to communicate to risk-averse companies that New York State is committed to nuclear power.
- **Local government acceptance.** State agencies could help provide education and events promoting the nuclear industry, as well as an orientation on nuclear energy for newly elected officials. State agencies should connect existing nuclear host communities with other communities, provide technical support, and prioritize communities who express interest in nuclear.
 - **Off-take challenges.** State agencies should help nuclear companies align with utilities.
 - **Transportation.** State agencies should help identify transportation nodes for nuclear generation.

Next Steps

- BW laid out next steps for the subcommittee. The next meeting on June 11 will focus on prioritization. If any subcommittee members have additional thoughts or ideas, they can email BW. BW will follow up with information about optional research interviews with subcommittee members.

Action Items and Next Steps

Task	Assigned to	Target date
Send follow-up email with summary meeting notes to all participants and slides to TWG members.	ERG/NYSERDA	June 10
Schedule research interviews with subcommittee members (optional).	BW	Late May / early June

Participants

Member Organizations

GE Vernova
Lightbridge Corporation
Manufacturers Association of Central New York (MACNY)
New York State American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (NYS AFL-CIO)
Operation Oswego County
State University of New York Maritime College (SUNY Maritime)
Workforce Development Institute (WDI)

Outside Expert Organizations

Broome County
Newcleo
TerraPower

New York State Staff

Aaron Baltich-Schechter, New York State Department of State (DOS)
Aimee Bell-Pasht, NYSERDA
Alyse Peterson, NYSERDA
Andrew Kincaid, New York State Department of Public Service (DPS)
James Kostenblatt, Empire State Development
Jessica Dealy, NYSERDA
Kevin Hale, NYSERDA
Susan Landfried, DOS
Talia Rosenberg, DPS
Thomas Madden, NYSERDA

Contractor Team

Cai Steger, BW
Charles Goodhue, ERG
Julian Ugalde, BW
Kaitlin Schneider, ERG
Kecil Jon, ERG
Philip Jordan, BW