BRETT GUTHRIE, KENTUCKY
CHAIRMAN

FRANK PALLONE, JR., NEW JERSEY
RANKING MEMBER

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE
2125 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6115
Majority (202) 225-3641
Minority (202) 225-2927

November 5, 2026

The Honorable Theodore J. Garrish
Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy
United States Department of Energy
1000 Independence Avenue SW
Washington, DC 20585

Dear Assistant Secretary Garrish:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Energy on Tuesday, September 15, 2026, to testify at the hearing entitled "Nuclear Spent Fuel Policy: Examining Nuclear Lifecycle Innovation Campuses."

Pursuant to the Rules of the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the hearing record remains open for ten business days to permit Members to submit additional questions for the record, which are attached. The format of your responses to these questions should be as follows: (1) the name of the Member whose question you are addressing, (2) the complete text of the question you are addressing in bold, and (3) your answer to that question in plain text.

To facilitate the printing of the hearing record, please respond to these questions with a transmittal letter by the close of business on Friday, November 20, 2026. Your responses should be mailed to Seth Ricketts Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515 and e-mailed to Seth.Ricketts@mail.house.gov.

Thank you again for your time and effort preparing and delivering testimony before the Subcommittee.

Sincerely,



Robert E. Latta
Chairman
Subcommittee on Energy

cc: Kathy Castor, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Energy

Attachment

Additional Questions for the Record

The Honorable Bob Latta (R-OH)

1. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act focuses exclusively on a repository at Yucca Mountain. Will authorizing secondary disposal pathways in the law enable DOE to continue to negotiate with States that have come forward?

2. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act and this Committee's work has focused on ensuring an integrated system for ultimate disposal of waste. Will DOE ensure there is linkage to permanent disposal in any negotiations?

3. Under the law, users of nuclear power pay a fee into a nuclear waste fund to pay for a program of permanent disposal. That fee was set to zero under court order because DOE dismantled its program. Would you agree that Congress should not raise rates on electric customers for a program still being developed?

4. The law requires the nuclear waste fund be spent on programs linked to permanent disposal. Does DOE support this concept?

    a. Should federal policies be updated to include reprocessing as part of a system for permanent disposal of waste?

5. What are states bringing to the table to ensure workable programs?

The Honorable Randy Weber (R-TX)

1. The Lifecycle Innovation Campuses are intended to help rebuild an end-to-end domestic nuclear fuel cycle, but that system ultimately depends on a reliable supply of uranium at the front end. How important is rebuilding domestic uranium mining and milling capacity, and should a sustained Strategic Uranium Reserve complement the campuses by providing a long-term demand signal that supports investment in American uranium production?

The Honorable Rick Allen (R-GA)

1. What is the sequencing for the host states, will they have to be shown that reprocessing is workable before agreeing to interim storage or to dispose of fuel?

    a. How long will that take?

2. When somebody talks about using the Nuclear Waste Fund to fund the campuses, they are just referring to funds the utility customers paid for disposal, not for ancillary economic development. How will these campuses attract substantial private financial investment to avoid more burdens on ratepayers?

3. What is DOE's role to ensure private investment? Or will that be the state responsibility?

The Honorable Nick Langworthy (R-NY)

1. The Department of Energy and the State of New York are working together to complete the cleanup of the West Valley site, which was used for nuclear fuel reprocessing from 1966 to 1972.

   This project continues to be one of the best values for the taxpayer. Last year, the team successfully took down the Main Plant Processing Building—a major accomplishment for DOE and its contracting partners.

   We are at a major inflection point in the cleanup project as the effort's next phase includes the removal of approximately 10 million cubic feet of soil. This work is critical to reducing long term environmental risk.

   The current authorization sunsets at the end of this month – there is active reauthorization legislation in both chambers. The bill reauthorizes the cleanup effort and level sets the authorized funding level to match the scope of the work to achieve the Department's shared mission at West Valley.

   With the Administration's support of the legislation at the proposed authorization level, we can safely and efficiently deliver on this mission.
   As the West Valley Demonstration Project enters its next phase of cleanup, including the removal of approximately 10 million cubic feet of soil, how important is timely reauthorization of the project and an authorization level that reflects the scope of the remaining work to DOE's ability to safely and efficiently complete the cleanup mission?

The Honorable Michael Rulli (R-OH)

1. I applaud the Administration for its work to reinvigorate our energy sector. As part of this, the Midwest and Appalachia have been leaders in rebuilding America's nuclear industry.

   Elementl is building an advanced reactor in Meigs County, Ohio, while Oklo is building modular reactors down the river in Piketon, where Centrus has been enriching fuel for nearly three years. Just across the river, West Virginia is one of six states listed for a Nuclear Lifecycle Innovation Campus.

   With the United States pursuing a full nuclear lifecycle approach, what investments are needed to ensure we have enough skilled workers to build, operate, and maintain these facilities?

   a. What opportunities do you see for skilled trades, construction workers, manufacturers, and community colleges to participate in building the broader nuclear supply chain?

b. What potential benefits do you see for how these campuses will ultimately benefit neighboring states like Ohio that are building out their own nuclear sites and have nearby nuclear industry?

c. As a follow-up, DOE received significant state interest in the Nuclear Lifecycle Innovation Campus initiative but has initially moved forward with a limited number of states. Is DOE's process still open to additional states, and what technical, commercial, infrastructure, and state-level criteria will DOE use to determine which additional proposals should advance?

The Honorable Kevin Mullin (D-CA)

1. In California, most of our nuclear power plants have stopped operating. Without a long-term federal repository for spent nuclear fuel, these decommissioned sites have had to continue storing waste material on-site. This poses safety and security challenges for surrounding communities and prevents them from repurposing the sites. This is further compounded by the fact that nearly all of California's sites are along the coast or in seismically active zones. So we must find long-term disposal solutions for the spent fuel. But the transfer of the material won't happen overnight. We have seen numerous instances where the Administration has revoked grants to states merely for having voted Democratic in the last election. I want to ensure that partisan political motivations don't govern the transfer of nuclear material. What criteria will the Department of Energy use to prioritize removal of spent fuel from sites across the country?

2. Innovators have proposed recycling spent fuel to power a new generation of nuclear reactors. While the technology is still in development, reusing this material presents a real opportunity, and I want to ensure that the Department of Energy has the right tools to support it. What are the minimum statutory fixes the Department of Energy needs to enable development of these technologies, safely store spent fuel at Innovation Campuses, and support public-private partnerships?