

Dear 2015 RIC attendees:

Thank you for making the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC's) 27thth annual Regulatory Information Conference (RIC) such a success! We really do appreciate your participation and support this year.

In an effort to build on the achievements and to address any challenges from our 2015 conference, we are asking you to complete this stakeholder survey to help the NRC provide a better experience for you at future RICs. Please note that this survey takes approximately ten (10) minutes to complete and is completely anonymous. Responses are tracked by question and not by respondent.

Once again, we thank you for your support of the RIC!

SECTION 1: GENERAL

1. What best describes your participation at the RIC?

This was my first year I attend fairly often I attend every year

2. What best describes your professional status?

NRC Non-NRC

3. What factors influenced your decision to attend the conference (mark all that apply):

Interest in nuclear regulation Networking opportunities
 Latest research information No registration fee
 Interest in nuclear safety and security Location
 Opportunity to present views Cost of hotel
 Easy access on Metrorail Career advancement

SECTION 2: PLENARY SESSIONS

1. What are your thoughts or comments about the Opening Session:

Excellent Good Average Poor I did not attend

2. What are your thoughts or comments about the Commissioners Plenary Sessions:

Excellent Good Average Poor I did not attend

3. What are your thoughts or comments about the Special Plenary session:

Excellent Good Average Poor I did not attend

SECTION 3: TECHNICAL SESSIONS

1. How many sessions did you attend?

 1 2 3 4 5 6+

1. The content of the technical sessions, as delivered, were sufficiently technical and met my expectations based on how they were promoted:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

2. Sufficient opportunity was provided during the technical sessions to ask questions and/or express individual views:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

SECTION 4: MATERIALS AND SUPPORT

1. The program content and supporting information were readily accessible on the RIC website prior to the conference:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

2. The conference information on the RIC website was clear, informative and helpful:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

3. The onsite hard copy conference program and pocket guide were clear, informative and helpful:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

4. The RIC mobile optimized agenda feature that was available to RIC participants during the conference was straight forward, user friendly, and helpful:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
 I did not access it

5. The use of Quick Response (QR) codes to electronically access RIC program information and materials during the conference was straight forward, user friendly, and helpful:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
 I did not use them

6. The use of social media (NRC Blog, Twitter, Facebook, YouTube, Flickr) to obtain RIC-related information real-time was straight forward, user friendly, and helpful:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
 I did not use them

SECTION 5: ONSITE ACTIVITIES

1. The RIC technical poster and tabletop presentations on display were sufficiently technical in content and worthwhile:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

2. Touring the NRC Headquarters Operations Center was a valuable experience:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
 I did not participate in a tour

3. The Lunchtime Workshop was a interesting and informative:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
 I did not participate in the lunchtime workshop

4. ~~The MILES Demonstration was interesting and informative:~~

~~Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree
 I did not participate in the demonstration~~

SECTION 6: CONFERENCE FACILITY (HOTEL):

1. ~~The physical setup for each plenary and technical breakout session (i.e., room size, use of audio-visual support) was appropriate:~~

~~Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree~~

1. ~~What feedback regarding the conference facility's property or its location that you would you like to share:~~

SECTION 7: ONLINE AND ONSITE REGISTRATION

1. The online registration process on the RIC website was clear, informative, and easy to use, and efficient:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

2. The automated registration confirmation was clear, timely and helpful:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

3. The electronic self-registration onsite was easy, efficient, and effective:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

I did not use this service

SECTION 8: Overall

1. The RIC met the overall objective: “to provide a communication forum and to encourage openness in areas regarding nuclear safety and security initiatives and regulatory issues”:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

2. The RIC provided attendees with new, important, pertinent, and useful information:

Strongly Agree Agree Neutral Disagree Strongly Disagree

3. Please rate your overall experience at the 2015 RIC, and share any feedback that would be helpful to RIC organizers in consideration and planning for the next RIC:

Excellent Good Satisfactory Needs Improvement

Thank you for your time and we look forward to seeing you at next year’s RIC.

Submit

The estimated burden to respond to this voluntary information collection is 10 minutes. The information provided will be used to determine areas of improvement for future conferences. If a means used to impose an information collection does not display a currently valid OMB control number, the NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person not required to respond to, the information collection.

OMB NO. 3150-0217

EXPIRES: January 31, 2017