

## Kristen Benney

---

**Subject:** FW: Indiana Comments NRC-2024-0211

---

**From:** King, Alexandra <[AIKing1@dhs.IN.gov](mailto:AIKing1@dhs.IN.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 25, 2025 12:49 PM  
**To:** Jeffery Lynch <[Jeffery.Lynch@nrc.gov](mailto:Jeffery.Lynch@nrc.gov)>  
**Cc:** ext\_Courtney\_Eckstein <[ceckstein@dhs.in.gov](mailto:ceckstein@dhs.in.gov)>  
**Subject:** [External\_Sender] Indiana Comments NRC-2024-0211

Hi Jeff,

I have attached Indiana's comments about docket NRC-2024-0211.

- 1. The proposed collection is necessary for the NRC to fulfill its statutory responsibilities under the Atomic Energy Act. The information enables effective coordination between federal and state regulators, ensuring that oversight activities are working together and not duplicating efforts. It helps keep the public's confidence for nuclear safety and addresses local concerns with the NRC.
- 2. I would not say accurate for Indiana. Best course of action for Indiana would be to send a nuclear engineer HP and a REP staff member to shadow. While we would have to hire a nuclear engineer (100k) otherwise we would just pay for travel as it would be a part of their normal job functions.
- 3. The ways that enhancing the quality, utility, and clarity of the information can be achieved is by developing standardized reporting templates to ensure consistency across states, providing detailed guidance documents and examples to reduce ambiguity, and establishing a feedback system so states can suggest improvements based on real life experience. Another best practice is to present data given would be in a sit down (or web-based) conversation with the state and the NRC after the inspection. I know that is how my inspectors got the most out of shadowing Purdue 1 reactor.
- 4. The burden on state respondents can be minimized by combining reporting system with existing required reporting systems to reduce duplicate data entry and be mindful of time and effort. Leveraging information already reported to other federal or state agencies to avoid duplicate efforts for similar objectives, and scaling requirements to reflect the size and capacity of state agencies so that smaller regulators are not excessively burdened by the requirements. Along with making sure these types of surveys get to the right part of Radiation Sections in other states. Arkansas and North Carolina specifically have their material heads as SLOs instead of their response/ REP managers. Indiana is a state where all radiation/nuclear is together and we all work together, not all state or even the majority are like that.

Best,

**Leksi King, MPA**

Radiological Emergency Preparedness Manager

Indiana Department of Homeland Security

302 W. Washington Street, Room E-208

Indianapolis, IN. 46204-2739

Work Cell: 317-696-1215

Watch Desk/Radiation Emergencies: 800-669-7362

Email: [alking1@dhs.in.gov](mailto:alking1@dhs.in.gov)

Web: [www.in.gov/dhs](http://www.in.gov/dhs)

