

FRED UPTON, MICHIGAN  
CHAIRMAN

FRANK PALLONE, JR., NEW JERSEY  
RANKING MEMBER

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH 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) 225-2927  
Minority (202) 225-3641

June 9, 2015

The Honorable Greg R. White  
Commissioner  
Michigan Public Service Commission  
P.O. Box 30221  
Lansing, MI 48909

Dear Commissioner White:

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy on Friday, May 15, 2015, to testify at the hearing entitled "Update on the Current State of Nuclear Waste Management Policy."

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 Tuesday, June 23, 2015. Your responses should be mailed to Will Batson, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515 and e-mailed to [Will.Batson@mail.house.gov](mailto:Will.Batson@mail.house.gov).

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

Sincerely,



John Shimkus  
Chairman  
Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy

cc: The Honorable Paul Tonko, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Environment and the Economy

Attachment

## Additional Questions for the Record

### The Honorable John Shimkus

1. As Congress moves forward to address the logjam associated with nuclear waste management policy, how can we protect the taxpayer to assure that total lifecycle system costs, including transportation, are not increased? What are some key principles to consider?
2. Currently the Nuclear Waste Fund can only be spent on the repository program. Would NARUC support the use of Nuclear Waste Fund resources to enter into a contract with a private entity for the purpose of consolidated interim storage?
  - A. If so, how can Congress assure interim storage payments do not impact the long-term adequacy of the Nuclear Waste Fund to support a permanent repository?
  - B. If not, what would be the appropriate funding mechanism?
3. The Nuclear Waste Policy Act codified the principle of “linkage,” in which an interim storage facility cannot be licensed prior to the licensing of a permanent repository. This concept assures that interim storage facilities will not become a “de facto” permanent repository. Do you agree with this principle?
  - A. As noted, the current law prohibits the license of an interim site until a repository is licensed. Do you have additional suggestions as to how this process could be modified to provide for concurrent development as part of a nuclear waste management system?
  - B. What sort of stipulations would be required to assure a permanent repository would be constructed? For example, do you support a maximum capacity limit on a consolidated interim storage site?
  - C. Do you support economic benefits and incentives for states and communities that offer to host an interim storage site?
4. The Eddy Lea Energy Alliance recently proposed constructing an interim storage facility in Southeastern New Mexico. New Mexico Senator Martin Heinrich said, “I cannot support establishing an interim storage facility until we are sure that there will be a path forward to permanent disposal.”
  - A. Is the lack of progress on Yucca Mountain hampering our ability to move forward on interim storage?
  - B. Would an expeditious review of the Yucca License application provide more certainty for interim storage stakeholders?
5. The DC Court of Appeals ruled that the collection of the Nuclear Waste Fund fee is illegal following DOE’s dismantlement of a nuclear waste management program. What steps would need to happen for NARUC to support restarting collection of the fee?

6. Since its inception, the Nuclear Waste fee has been set at one mil, or one tenth of a penny, per kilowatt hour of electricity generated from nuclear energy. This has funded the ratepayer's contribution to Yucca Mountain to-date, with \$33 billion in the Nuclear Waste Fund administered by the Treasury Department. As Congress considers legislation relating to our nuclear waste management system, it is important to have the funding for the program align with the corresponding activities. How can Congress assure that the Nuclear Waste fee adequately provides for a repository program, while not imposing additional costs on electric consumers?