

ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH 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

May 23, 2017

Mr. Steven P. Nesbit  
Director  
Nuclear Policy and Support  
Duke Energy – EC07H  
526 South Church Street  
Charlotte, NC 28202

Dear Mr. Nesbit,

Thank you for appearing before the Subcommittee on Environment on Wednesday, April 26, 2017, to testify at the hearing entitled “H.R. \_\_\_, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017.”

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 Wednesday, June 7, 2017. Your responses should be mailed to Elena Brennan, Legislative Clerk, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2125 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, DC 20515 and e-mailed in Word format to [Elena.Brennan@mail.house.gov](mailto:Elena.Brennan@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

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

Attachment

## **Attachment – Additional Questions for the Record**

### **The Honorable John Shimkus**

1. If there were a monitored retrievable storage facility developed under this legislation, why do you propose to take shutdown plant fuel first? Would that require any special legislative language?
2. Why should the Department of Energy re-establish the Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management?
3. Section 602 of the Discussion Draft provides for a fixed-term appointment for the Director of DOE's Office of Civilian Radioactive Waste Management. How would this provision affect DOE's program management? Do you think five years is an appropriate length of time to provide continuity of leadership?