



BIPARTISAN POLICY CENTER

America's Nuclear Future: Taking Action to Address Nuclear Waste

TIMOTHY A. FRAZIER, DIRECTOR, NUCLEAR WASTE INITIATIVE
OCTOBER 1, 2014

WWW.BIPARTISANPOLICY.ORG

About the Bipartisan Policy Center

The Bipartisan Policy Center (BPC) is a non-profit organization that was established in 2007 by former Senate Majority Leaders Howard Baker, Tom Daschle, Bob Dole and George Mitchell to develop and promote solutions that can attract public support and political momentum in order to achieve real progress. BPC acts as an incubator for policy efforts that engage top political figures, advocates, academics and business leaders in the art of principled compromise.



BPC's Energy Project

In April 2011, BPC launched its Energy Project led by former Senators Trent Lott, Byron Dorgan, former National Security Advisor General Jim Jones (ret.), and former EPA Administrator William Reilly.

Project Goals

- Encourage substantive, bipartisan dialogue among key interest groups and decision makers on national energy goals and strategies;
- Engage and shape near-term energy policy agendas;
- Produce research products on a variety of energy issues; and
- Develop consensus recommendations to guide national energy policy.

Goal

- Spur action to address nuclear waste

Objectives

- Expand the national and regional conversation on nuclear waste
- Develop common bipartisan interests across the United States
- Develop an implementation plan to eliminate barriers and encourage action
- Coordinate diverse groups of interested parties to take action on nuclear waste
- Establish the sense of urgency that existed after the BRC Final Report

Advisory Council members

- Former elected Representatives/Senators
- Environmental community
- Nuclear utilities and industry
- Members of the Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future
- Executive Committee

Advisory Council Members Responsibilities

- Direction
- Guidance

	Advisory Council (shaded names are Executive Committee of the Advisory Council)
1	Vicky A. Bailey, Principal, Anderson Stratton Enterprises, LLC
2	Frances Beinecke, President, Natural Resources Defense Council
3	David Blee, Executive Director, U.S. Nuclear Infrastructure Council
4	Peter Bradford, Former Commissioner, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Vermont
5	Beatrice Brailsford, Nuclear Program Director, Snake River Alliance
6	Norm Dicks, Former U.S. Representative, Washington's Sixth Congressional District
7	Alex Flint, Senior Vice President, Governmental Affairs, Nuclear Energy Institute
8	Dennis Hastert, Senior Advisor, Dickstein Shapiro LLP
9	Dick Kelly, Former Chairman and Chief Executive Officer of Xcel Energy
10	Richard A. Meserve, President Emeritus, Carnegie Institution for Science
11	Phil Sharp, President, Resources for the Future, Former U.S. Representative
12	Governor Ted Strickland, Former Governor of Ohio
13	David Wright, Former Chairman, South Carolina Public Service Commission and Former President of NARUC

Regional Meetings

- Locations
 - Northeast – MIT, June 2014
 - Southeast – Georgia Tech. September 2014
 - Midwest – Chicago, November 2014
 - West – California, January 2015
- Private Invitation-only Meeting
 - Facilitated roundtable discussion
 - Chatham House Rule
- Public event (live webcast)
 - Panel discussion of relevant regional issues

Summaries of meetings prepared and analyzed

- Summaries posted online
- Feedback/comments requested
(nuclearwaste@bipartisanpolicy.org)

BRC style “What We Heard” report after last meeting

Peter Bradford, Advisory Council
Alex Flint, Advisory Council
Denny Hastert, Advisory Council
David Wright, Advisory, Council
Nuclear Science and Engineering Department, MIT
Citizen Advisory Board for Maine Yankee
Yankee Atomic Electric Company Former Director, Northeast High-Level Radioactive Waste Transportation Project
New England Conference of Public Utilities Commissioners
Pilgrim Watch
Hudson River Program, Riverkeeper, Inc.
Assistant Attorney General, Vermont
Assistant Attorney General, Connecticut
Natural Resources Defense Council
Clean Air Task Force

Georgia Public Service Commission
Nuclear and Radiological Engineering/Medical Physics Program, Georgia Tech
South Carolina Governor's Nuclear Advisory Council
Savannah River Site Community Reuse Corporation
Mississippi Energy Institute
Emory University School of Law
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy
Savannah River Site Watch
Duke Energy
Southern Nuclear
Nuclear Waste Strategy Coalition
Office of Public Counsel, State of Florida
Southeast Office of the Nuclear Information and Resource Service
South Carolina Chapter of the Sierra Club; National Sierra Nuclear Free Campaign

“Addressing nuclear waste” means different things to different people, such as:

- **providing a comprehensive solution allowing for a dual-track approach for consolidated storage and a deep geological repository;**
- **expediting the transfer from pool storage to dry cask;**
- **removing responsibility for nuclear waste from the Department of Energy and establishing a federal corporation;**
- **following the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, which dictates Yucca Mountain; or**
- **closing nuclear plants now to avoid producing additional nuclear waste.**

Barriers to taking action include:

- **the structure and responsibilities NRC; it should not regulate and provide oversight;**
- **not following the existing Nuclear Waste Policy Act;**
- **congressional inaction, especially when caused by certain political constituencies;**
- **the lack of confidence in the federal government regarding nuclear waste;**
- **the absence of a federal corporation with nuclear waste responsibility and the independence to operate;**
- **the failure to define “consent-based”;** and
- **the lack of state regulatory authority or involvement with nuclear power plants and the waste stored there.**

Consent must include meaningful regulatory authority and involvement.

A pilot project to initiate centralized, consolidated storage with a research element would be a good starting point.

On consolidated storage

- **The United States needs a dedicated plan for next steps leading to consolidated storage.**
- **Consolidated storage is likely to last for several decades.**
- **Consolidated storage could be a diversion of resources from the effort to site and operate a national repository.**

Site searches best to be driven from the bottom up – local to state – or the top down – state to local?

Actions to establish a renewed sense of urgency:

- **highlight safety and economic issues and**
- **emphasize the key role nuclear power can play in complying with climate change regulations.**

Addressing nuclear waste means different things to different people, such as:

- **Making any progress – even incremental – on the issue.**
- **Disposing of highly-radioactive nuclear waste in a geological repository.**
- **Establishing consolidated storage with a focus on decommissioned sites.**
- **Finding a long-term solution rather than consolidated storage.**
- **Utilizing hardened on-site storage (HOSS).**
- **Stopping production of nuclear waste.**
- **Moving spent nuclear fuel from pools to dry cask storage – preferably HOSS.**
- **Developing reprocessing and fast reactors.**
- **Also addressing DHLW.**
- **Taking the responsibility for nuclear waste away from DOE.**

Actions to move forward may include:

- **Replacing DOE with a single-purpose organization as recommended by the President’s Blue Ribbon Commission on America’s Nuclear Future.**
- **Developing consensus papers supported by environmental NGOs, grassroots organizations, and industry.**
- **Initiating efforts to discuss and define framework for “consent.”**
- **Highlighting the existence of DHLW and other defense wastes that will need long-term, geological disposal.**
- **Emphasizing the movement of nuclear waste from the decommissioned sites to consolidated storage or geological depositories.**

Barriers to taking action include:

- **DOE and a general lack of leadership.**
- **The absence of a “uniquely organized entity” with nuclear waste responsibility.**
- **A lack of consensus on the definition of “consent.”**
- **A failure to address DHLW and other defense wastes, which are lost in the discussion about spent nuclear fuel and other nuclear wastes.**
- **An education gap and lack of understanding of the various and interconnected facets of nuclear waste.**
- **Keeping reprocessing “on the table” as a solution.**
- **Taking reprocessing “off the table” as a solution.**

Addressing nuclear waste means different things to different people, such as:

- **Making some progress.**
- **Disposing of highly-radioactive nuclear waste in a geological repository.**
- **Establishing consolidated storage with a focus on decommissioned sites.**
- **Finding a long-term solution rather than consolidated storage.**
- **Utilizing hardened on-site storage (HOSS).**
- **Stopping production of nuclear waste.**
- **Moving spent nuclear fuel from pools to dry cask storage – preferably HOSS.**
- **Taking the responsibility for nuclear waste away from DOE.**

Actions to move forward may include:

- **Replacing DOE with a single-purpose organization as recommended by the President's Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future.**
- **Developing consensus papers supported by environmental NGOs, grassroots organizations, and industry.**
- **Initiating efforts to discuss and define framework for "consent."**
- **Highlighting the existence of DHLW and other defense wastes that will need long-term, geological disposal.**
- **Emphasizing the movement of nuclear waste from the decommissioned sites to consolidated storage or geological depositories.**

Barriers to taking action include:

- **DOE and a general lack of leadership.**
- **The absence of a "uniquely organized entity" with nuclear waste responsibility.**
- **A lack of consensus on the definition of "consent."**
- **A failure to address DHLW and other defense wastes, which are lost in the discussion about spent nuclear fuel and other nuclear wastes.**
- **An education gap and lack of understanding of the various and interconnected facets of nuclear waste.**
- **Keeping reprocessing "on the table" as a solution.**
- **Taking reprocessing "off the table" as a solution.**

Implementation plan will contain actionable items for all stakeholders

Consider comments from stakeholders and reviewed by stakeholders

Will include:

- **Public and stakeholder engagement toward taking action**
- **Keep the nuclear waste policy issues and actions/recommendations in the public**
- **Regional and national editorial boards**
- **Social media (blog posts and Twitter)**
- **Promote public events**

Assist Congress and the Administration with

- Hearings**
- Draft legislation**
- Policy**
- Regulatory**
- Provide assistance as experts**
- Educational materials**

Project will help legislators, regulators, and policy developers to better understand the technical and policy issues and stakeholders' views based on:

- Regional workshops**
- Continuing relationships with diverse interested parties**

Active Twitter Engagement

- Nuclear waste facts
- Various interesting articles and things to read
- #nuclearwaste

Email Updates

- Email list of interested parties
- Meeting summaries

Infographics

Frequently Asked Questions

- Update based on regional meetings and other discussions
- Posted online and tweeted

Other Planned Outputs

- Guest Blog Posts
- Editorials
- Short Issue Briefs

Regional Meetings

- Chicago
- California (San Onofre)
- Others needed?

Topical meetings/workshops

Additional outreach to NGOs, grassroots, and other stakeholders

- Working meetings
- “Listening” meeting to hear their concerns
 - Ensure they are heard
- Enlist their support and action where we can
- Develop their constituencies



BIPARTISAN POLICY CENTER

Questions?

WWW.BIPARTISANPOLICY.ORG