1	NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
2	RPTS SHIPLE
3	HIF172030
4	
5	
6	MARKUP OF H.R. 1320, NUCLEAR UTILIZATION OF
7	KEYNOTE ENERGY ACT; H.R. 6140, ADVANCED
8	NUCLEAR FUEL AVAILABILITY ACT; H.R,
9	ADVANCING U.S. CIVIL NUCLEAR COMPETITIVENESS
10	AND JOBS ACT; AND H.R. 6141, TO REQUIRE THE
11	SECRETARY OF ENERGY TO DEVELOP A REPORT ON A
12	PILOT PROGRAM TO SITE, CONSTRUCT, AND
13	OPERATE MICRO-REACTORS AT CRITICAL NATIONAL
14	SECURITY LOCATIONS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES
15	THURSDAY, JUNE 21, 2018
16	House of Representatives
17	Subcommittee on Energy
18	Committee on Energy and Commerce
19	Washington, D.C.
20	
21	
22	
23	The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in
24	Room 2123 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Fred Upton [chairman
25	of the subcommittee] presiding.

Members present: Representatives Upton, Olson, Barton,
Shimkus, Latta, Harper, McKinley, Kinzinger, Griffith, Johnson,
Long, Bucshon, Flores, Mullin, Hudson, Cramer, Walberg, Duncan,
Walden (ex officio), Rush, McNerney, Peters, Green, Doyle,
Castor, Sarbanes, Welch, Tonko, Loebsack, Schrader, Kennedy,
Butterfield, and Pallone (ex officio).

Staff present: Jennifer Barblan, Chief Counsel, Oversight & Investigations; Mike Bloomquist, Deputy Staff Director; Samantha Bopp, Staff Assistant; Daniel Butler, Staff Assistant; Karen Christian, General Counsel; Kelly Collins, Legislative Clerk, Energy/Environment; Margaret Tucker Fogarty, Staff Assistant; Adam Fromm, Director of Outreach and Coalitions; Ali Fulling, Legislative Clerk, Oversight & Investigations, Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection; Theresa Gambo, Human Resources/Office Administrator; Jordan Haverly, Policy Coordinator, Environment; Peter Kielty, Deputy General Counsel; Mary Martin, Chief Counsel, Energy/Environment; Sarah Matthews, Press Secretary; Brandon Mooney, Deputy Chief Counsel, Energy; Mark Ratner, Policy Coordinator; Peter Spencer, Professional Staff Member, Energy; Austin Stonebraker, Press Assistant; Madeline Vey, Policy Coordinator, Digital Commerce and Consumer Protection; Evan Viau, Legislative Clerk, Communications & Technology; Hamlin Wade, Special Advisor, External Affairs; Andy Zach, Senior Professional Staff Member, Environment; Jeff Carroll, Minority Staff Director; Elizabeth Ertel, Minority

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

Deputy Clerk; Rick Kessler, Minority Senior Advisor and Staff
Director, Energy and Environment; John Marshall, Minority Policy
Coordinator; Dan Miller, Minority Policy Analyst; Alexander
Ratner, Minority Policy Analyst; Tim Robinson, Minority Chief
Counsel; Tuley Wright, Minority Energy and Environment Policy
Advisor: and Catherine Zander Minority Environment Fallow

Mr. Upton. Good morning, everybody. Welcome to the Subcommittee on Energy markup of four bills addressing the development, deployment, competitiveness, and regulation of nuclear energy technologies.

You know, throughout this Congress we have repeatedly heard about the immense challenges facing all parts of our nation's nuclear industry. And while individual states have taken steps to preserve specific nuclear power plants, the underlying intellectual and industrial nuclear infrastructure is at risk of further atrophy in the absence of a coherent and defined policy from the federal government.

The bills today take some important steps to establish that policy. At a hearing on these four bills last month, the Department of Energy's Office of Nuclear Energy, the National Nuclear Security Administration, and industry leaders discussed the urgent need to take action now due to the time-consuming and complex requirements associated with licensing and developing nuclear facilities.

So the bills before us address that need. They have been developed in coordination with feedback from members of this committee, the Department of Energy and NRC, and a broad range of stakeholders. I look forward to continuing bipartisan collaboration to advance these four proposals. The first proposal that we are going to consider this morning is the committee print titled Advancing U.S. Civil Nuclear

Competitiveness and Jobs Act offered by Congressman Johnson.

This bill will assist our U.S. nuclear industry's ability to compete successfully in an increasingly competitive global market. The proposal provides a more predictable and efficient authorization process for the review and approval of low proliferation risks and technologies, and such steps will help level the playing field for American companies in the international competition of nuclear energy.

The next bill, H.R. 1320, the Nuclear Utilization of Keynote Energy, or NUKE Act, is a bipartisan bill sponsored by Representative Kinzinger and Doyle to make targeted reforms to the NRC's fee structure and streamline certain licensing and This bill will increase transparency, regulatory actions. predictability, and efficiency in the regulatory process which, for sure, will benefit our constituents who fund the NRC through user fees embedded in the cost of nuclear generated electricity. The more efficient streamlined decisionmaking process established by this legislation will lay the groundwork for more predictable timing for our current and future nuclear Advanced Nuclear Fuel Availability Act, H.R. infrastructure. 6140, is a bipartisan bill introduced by Representatives Flores and McNerney to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to make high-assay, low-enriched uranium available for use in the first of a kind advanced nuclear reactor design. fuel will enable the development and deployment of a new

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

90

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

generation of innovative nuclear technologies in the U.S.

And, lastly, H.R. 6141, a bipartisan bill again sponsored by Representatives Hudson, Peters, Wilson, and Norcross directs the Secretary of Energy in collaboration with the NRC, Department of Defense, and GSA to identify key components of a pilot program to site, construct, and operate very small nuclear reactors known as microreactors to provide energy resilience for mission-critical national security functions. Such a pilot program could capture some of the unique and revolutionary characteristics of tomorrow's nuclear reactor designs and provide additional benefits for revitalizing the U.S. nuclear industry.

More work remains to be done to reassert the global leadership of American nuclear know-how for the next generation, but this legislation before us today is a good and essential step towards a multifaceted strategy.

I yield for an opening statement to the ranking member of the subcommittee, my friend Mr. Rush from Chicago.

Mr. Rush. I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, before I get into this suite of nuclear bills that is before us today, I just want to reiterate my position that I touched on in yesterday's hearing. As I mentioned, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Pallone and I along with all 24 Democratic members of the full committee, sent a letter to Chairman Walden and Health Subcommittee Chairman Burgess on yesterday requesting an immediate hearing on the Trump

administration's misguided policy of separating immigrant children from their parents at our southern border. While the President, Mr. Chairman, may have suddenly shifted his stance and signed an executive order undoing this abominable policy for the time being, who knows when he might change his mind on a whim and reverse himself once again. Mr. Chairman, it is critical that we hear from key Administration officials on how this loathsome policy came about. More importantly, as the elected representatives we need answers on how many of these children were ripped from their parents, where are all of these children now, and what is the Administration's procedure for assuring that all of these babies will indeed be reunited with their parents.

This is an important issue that is of the utmost concern to many, if not all, Americans regardless of their political leanings or religious affiliations, so hopefully we can schedule this hearing sooner rather than later.

With that being said, Mr. Chairman, as I stated in the hearing on these four nuclear bills, it is my desire that we work with the majority side to attempt to find consensus so that these bills are forwarded on the full committee with bipartisan support.

Mr. Chairman, the most problematic of these three bills, four bills, rather, for me is the Advancing U.S. Civil Nuclear Competitiveness and Jobs Act. This bill will, among other things, revise DOE's review of the Part 810 process by expediting procedures for transferring civilian nuclear technology

including to foreign powers. I can tell you, Mr. Chairman that I have even less confidence in the Trump administration than I had a few weeks ago when we held a hearing on this bill so I do not see the wisdom in this moving this bill at this time.

Mr. Upton. The gentleman's time is expired. The chair would recognize for an opening statement the chairman of the full committee, Mr. Walden.

With that Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of time.

The Chairman. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership and for acknowledging me on these energy issues. Good job to the committee. This morning we are going to continue to advance our legislative efforts to modernize the Department of Energy to better reflect the Department's current national and energy security missions. Now throughout this Congress, as you all know, we have sought specific DOE authorities to update in light of an ever-changing energy landscape and evolving national security threats. Today's subcommittee markup continues these efforts; also includes modernizing nuclear policies that Congress originally embedded in DOE's predecessor agency, the Atomic Energy Commission. When the Atomic Energy Act was amended in 1954, those authorities now reside at both DOE and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Our nation's expertise in nuclear energy from safely operating reactors to the application of technology to the strong regulatory regime is the best in the world. However, our foreign

competitors are making strategic investments to directly support
their respective nuclear interests to gain an advantage in
emerging markets. So we should recognize that foreign government
support for expansion of their nuclear industries into new markets
is driven by more than economic interest. There are profound
national security and strategic implications for dominance in
the civil nuclear space and so we must appropriately consider
the implications of losing our leadership position in developing
markets and align our national policy accordingly. The
thoughtful legislative proposals we will consider this morning
target specific challenges facing America's nuclear scientists,
innovators, suppliers, and reactor operators. So the bills will
help deploy advanced nuclear technologies, enhance our nuclear
supplier industry's ability to effectively compete in global
markets, and establish transparency and predictability in our
regulatory framework. Each of these bills can help
reinvigorate different components of our nuclear ecosystem and
in doing so the legislation will facilitate innovation and
competition which provides the dual benefits of both being good
for consumers while protecting our national security interests.
So I really want to thank members on both sides of the aisle
who worked on these bills, including Representatives Kinzinger
and Doyle, Hudson, Peters, Flores and McNerney, and Johnson.
Your leadership has really made a difference and we are going
to move these common sense, bipartisan policies forward. It is

appreciated.

Thank you for your work and I look forward to supporting this effort. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. The chair would recognize the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Today the subcommittee will markup our four nuclear energy bills. At the legislative hearing in May, I expressed concern with two of the proposals before us. First, the Advancing U.S. Civil Nuclear Competitiveness and Jobs Act makes changes to the Part 810 process by which the Secretary of Energy authorizes the transfer of nuclear energy technology and assistance to foreign countries.

The bill establishes a brief 30-day timeframe for the Secretary to approve the transfer of certain nuclear technologies to countries that are not nuclear weapon states and I am uncomfortable with expediting the review process for Part 810 at a time when there is so much global uncertainty with regard to nuclear proliferation.

H.R. 1320 introduced by Representatives Kinzinger and Doyle makes several major changes to the NRC budgeting process and fee structure and I have concerns with the provision of the bill that sets up an expedited timeline for NRC review of nuclear reactors because inflexible deadlines could jeopardize the environmental and safety review process for more complex applications. And

I am also concerned with a provision requiring NRC to issue a construction permit for a nuclear facility even if an entity has filed a formal request for a hearing objecting to the project.

And I think stakeholders should have a chance to voice their concerns publicly before a project permit is issued.

But despite those concerns, I appreciate our colleagues' efforts to address the financial strain currently facing the nuclear industry and I want to continue to work with them on this bill.

But if I could just say I want to reiterate in the time I have left what Ranking Member Bobby Rush said about the children separation. I would strongly request that this committee hold a hearing immediately on the President's family separation policy that has led to more than 2,300 children being separated from their parents. I hope yesterday's executive order puts an end to the barbaric separation of families.

But I am concerned that these families will continue to face inhumane treatment at the hands of the Trump administration.

All of us on this committee should demand that the Administration must now immediately reunite each of the more 2,300 children who have already been separated from their parents. I actually saw some of them this Sunday on Father's Day and I think the Department HHS has been sending conflicting signals as to whether it will reunite these families.

I know that every Democrat on this committee made a request

2.42

257 to Chairman Walden and Burgess for a hearing as soon as possible, so I was just going to ask if I could, Mr. Chairman -- well, I 258 259 guess he left. All right, well. All right, let me just say that 260 we are hoping and I am going to follow up with both Chairman Walden 261 and Chairman Burgess to see if we can have a hearing as soon as 262 possible because I think this policy has created real trauma for 263 thousands of kids and we have to get answers from the Department 264 of Health and Human Services. 265 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 266 Mr. Upton. Thank you. 267 I would note for all members that their opening statements 268 could be made part of the record as a UC. Are there other members wishing to give an opening statement? 269 270 Seeing none on the Republican side, on the Democratic side? 271 The gentleman from California is recognized for an opening 272 statement. 273 Mr. Peters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, just briefly. 274 appreciate having my bill, H.R. 6141, on the agenda for the markup today following a successful legislative hearing in May and I 275 276 thank Mr. Hudson for his work on the bill. 277 As I have said before, our nuclear energy technologies are 278 an important part of increasing zero emission energy sources. 279 We need this energy generation and the clean air standards that 280 they can help us achieve. We also need to ensure those energy 281 solutions are being best utilized by our armed forces. Just this week, in fact, I spoke to the Association of Defense Communities about the future of energy use in the military and this importance cannot be stressed enough.

This bill would direct the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy to work together in analyzing how microreactors can bolster energy resiliency for national security. Doing so is an important step in developing the energy resources our armed forces need. In my home district in San Diego the DOD has been a willing and helpful partner in developing and testing innovative energy resources and I think the partnership in this bill makes sense and I appreciate my colleagues' supportive vote on it today and I yield back. Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. The chair would recognize Mr. Johnson for an opening statement.

Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for convening this important markup today relating to nuclear energy. I would like to briefly highlight one of the four important bills, a discussion draft titled The Advancing U.S. Nuclear Competitiveness and Jobs Act.

The Department of Energy plays a critical role in America's nuclear industry's engagement in international commerce through the Part 810 permitting process. With almost 200 gigawatts of new nuclear energy capacity projected to be added throughout the world by 2050, it is incumbent on Congress to ensure the Part 810 process is efficient and that it continues to maintain our

strong nuclear nonproliferation posture.

The U.S. nuclear industry faces intense foreign competition within the international civil nuclear market. Many foreign enterprises with state backing like Russia and China, those countries see getting a toehold in nuclear energy as a strategic tool to leverage themselves into a 100-year, state-to-state relationship with other countries. The discussion draft before us today ensures DOE's 810 process remains robust, safe, and predictable.

It takes common sense steps towards ensuring U.S. leadership and civil nuclear commerce continues to be competitive abroad without sacrificing national security concerns. I am hopeful that we can put politics aside today, focus on the policies of this draft, and pass it with bipartisan support. And with that I yield back.

Mr. Upton. The gentleman's time is expired. Other members wishing to give an opening statement?

Mr. Green?

Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Today we are marking up four different nuclear energy bills that would address many of the challenges faced by the nuclear sector. It is important that we clear the way for the new technology and limit burdens and regulatory structures where possible. I am a proud cosponsor of H.R. 1320, the Nuclear Utilization Keynote Energy Act, introduced by Mr. Doyle and Mr. Kinzinger. The bill makes several

drastically necessary changes to the Nuclear Regulatory

Commission's budget and fee structure as well as the license applications process.

As we lose more and more zero emission clean energy sources with the closure of nuclear plants across the country, the NRC fee structure faces an undue financial burden on the plants which remain in operation. It is important that we address this issue now and give existing nuclear plants a fee framework that reflects the 21st century. I am proud to support this bill and recommend the excellent work of both my colleagues Mr. Doyle and Mr. Kinzinger.

I also support H.R. 6140, the Advanced Nuclear Fuel Availability Act introduced by Mr. Flores and Mr. McNerney. The bill directs the Secretary of Energy to establish a program for support of high-assay, low-enriched uranium that is required by newer, advanced reactors. While supply of this fuel is still at issue, this bill takes many needed steps that will direct the Secretary to study questions that will put us on the path to a modern nuclear fleet in the 2030s.

Microreactors are another technology that I am excited to see this committee look into. I support H.R. 6141 by Representatives Wilson, Norcross, Hudson, and Peters to direct the DOE Secretary to develop a report for a pilot program for microreactors at critical national security sites. This technology has the potential to strengthen in some of our most

357 important sites for nuclear security. Sustainable, clean onsite power at these sites ensures that our nation's security will be 358 359 protected in the event of an attack allowing these important sites 360 to function as they were meant to be without interruption. 361 While I support many of the goals of Mr. Johnson's Advancing 362 U.S. Civil Nuclear Competitiveness and Jobs Act there is still 363 some outstanding issues with the bill as it currently stands that 364 permits me from supporting it today. U.S. nuclear technology 365 is best and safest in the world. There is a reason we see so 366 many foreign countries wishing to develop their infrastructure 367 with out expertise. While I feel that section 810 does --368 The gentleman's time is expiring. Mr. Upton. 369 I think 30 days is too short, Mr. Mr. Green. Okay. 370 Chairman, and hopefully before we go to markup in the full 371 committee that could be changed. And I appreciate your patience, 372 thank you. 373 Mr. Upton. The gentleman's time is expired. Other members wishing to give an opening statement? 374 Seeing none, the chair will call up the discussion draft 375 376 entitled Advancing U.S. Civil Nuclear Competitiveness and Jobs 377 Act and ask the clerk to report. 378 [The Bill follows:] 379 380 **********INSERT 1*******

381 The Clerk. Discussion Draft, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, to improve the process by which the Secretary of 382 383 Energy authorizes the transfer of civilian nuclear commerce 384 technology and assistance and for other purposes. 385 Mr. Upton. And, without objection, the first reading of The bill will be open for amendment 386 the bill is dispensed with. 387 at any point, so ordered. 388 Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? 389 Are there any other amendments to the bill? 390 Seeing none, the gentleman from Oregon --391 Mr. Schrader. Can I comment on the bill, Mr. Chairman? 392 Strike the last word, the gentleman is Mr. Upton. 393 recognized for 5 minutes. 394 Mr. Schrader. Yes. I would just like to thank my friend 395 from Ohio for introducing this bill and organize the 810 process. 396 I am an all-above member when it comes to energy policy, and 397 if we want to pursue an aggressive strategy to curb the effects 398 of carbon it is going to have to include not only renewable energy, 399 but I believe nuclear as well. I also want U.S. companies to 400 be competitive not only here at home, but internationally too. 401 With that said, I am not quite sure we are here yet with 402 I am not comfortable with the idea we are going to this bill. be mandating the Secretary review these applications or delegate 403 404 his authority or make a determination within just 30 days especially when we are talking about sending sensitive nuclear 405

technology to non-nuclear nations. That is completely unrealistic and, I believe, unsafe.

In addition, I think it would be more prudent if we had DOE also report back to Congress about the 810 process in making it more effective before we pass legislation expediting the program.

As a result I will be voting no today, but I would like to continue to work with Mr. Johnson and members of the committee to improve the bill before a full committee. And I thank the chairman and yield back.

Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. The chair would recognize to strike the last word, Mr. Johnson.

Mr. Johnson. Move to strike the last word, Mr. Chairman.

When Congress amended the Atomic Energy Act in 1954 to provide for the commercial use of nuclear technology, the United States was one of only a few countries who had nuclear energy capacity. Today, countries throughout the world have access to nuclear technology and the United States is no longer the only game in town. Today, our domestic nuclear suppliers face very stiff global competition mainly from nuclear state-owned vendors who use nuclear energy projects to implement national policy objectives and as a job creator back home. These state-owned entities will offer nuclear project debt with better terms than market rates and even use these projects as part of a larger deal and not simply a standalone commercial deal.

[Chart.]

Mr. Johnson. As the graph shows that you will see here, over 50 percent of new nuclear builds are currently going to China and Russia. That is concerning to me and it should be concerning to every member of this committee, especially considering nuclear power plants last a very long time. I don't know about everyone else in the room, but I prefer countries engaging with the United States rather than Russia to meet their peaceful nuclear energy needs.

So this discussion is about giving DOE and its staff the tools they need to safely and efficiently consider these specific authorizations, thereby helping our domestic nuclear suppliers to more effectively compete within this intensely competitive world market. Importantly, DOE has recognized the need for a timely review process for these authorizations and has made progress over the last several years to improve the efficiency and transparency of the Part 810 process. This has been under both Democratic and Republican administrations. In fact, in February 2015, DOE published efficiency revisions to the 810 regulations, the first such revision since 1986. Those revisions were based on recommendations that stemmed from a Government Accountability Office report requested by Chairman Upton.

This discussion draft builds upon that work through sensible statutory reforms, many of which DOE is unable to accomplish

through further rulemakings. Specifically, it directs the Secretary of Energy to establish procedures for predictable and timely consideration of exports of certain low-risk technologies. It permits the Secretary to delegate the approval of certain low-risk authorizations to reduce the paperwork and the workload for the Secretary, and it requires the Department of Energy to process authorizations concurrently during the interagency review.

This draft ensures important safeguards are in place and upheld, such as maintaining the current interagency review process, and still requires the State Department to receive assurances from a foreign government regarding the use and transfer of nuclear technology. I urge my colleagues to support this important draft and if my colleagues object to any of the policy provisions contained within the draft, I stand ready and willing to work on those provisions.

As the ranking member acknowledged during the legislative hearing on this draft, the 810 process must function well for the U.S. to remain competitive within the civil nuclear marketplace. This draft is a step towards achieving that goal and is crucial that we separate these common sense policy reforms from politics. I would also like to point out that there is bipartisan language contained within the Senate fiscal year 2019 NDAA aimed at improving the 810 process, so I would hope we would find some common ground on the House side as well.

There is clearly the need for this language and with that I urge my colleagues to support the draft. And now I would like to yield some time to my colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. Doyle, to speak on behalf of this bill.

Mr. Doyle. And I want to thank you for your work to address the 810 process. I have heard from several companies in my district who have faced challenges navigating the process to export nuclear technology. The demand for nuclear technology is growing in international markets and this presents a great opportunity for jobs not only in Pittsburgh but across the United States.

When we are exporting nuclear technology to other countries we must protect our national security and our nonproliferation goals. But there are also some common sense changes that can be made to this process for low-risk technology. This legislation takes important steps to do so. You know, if we are not able to export our technology other countries will step in to fill the void and American jobs will suffer. It is far better to have American technologies and companies on the ground in other countries than to have countries such as Russia building nuclear plants throughout the world.

I appreciate my colleague's effort to address this important issue and believe that we can streamline the process without sacrificing national security or our nonproliferation goals.

And I share the gentleman's comment that if we have members that

want to see some changes or have some concerns with this bill, let's work together and get this bill out of the committee. I thank you and I yield back.

Mr. Johnson. Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is this. We are either, if we are going to be competitiveness we have got to be responsive. If we are not responsive other nations like Russia and China are going to be, and we are going to lose our lead, our edge in nuclear nonproliferation. So with that I urge a yes vote on this legislation and I yield back.

Mr. Upton. The gentleman time is expired. The chair recognizes the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. Pallone, to strike the last word.

Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As I stated at the legislative hearing on this bill, I appreciate the Part 810 process must function well for the U.S. to remain competitive in the commercial nuclear space, but the bill establishes this brief 30-day frame for the Secretary to approve the transfer of certain low proliferation risk nuclear technologies to countries that are not nuclear weapon states. Further, President Trump has abandoned the Iran deal and now Saudi Arabia has said that if Iran restarts its nuclear program Saudi Arabia will, itself, pursue building nuclear weapons.

So I am uncomfortable with expediting the review process for Part 810 at a time when there is so much global uncertainty with regard to nuclear proliferation. Thirty days, I think, is

just too short of a timeframe in the current climate to properly address security questions regarding the use of these nuclear technologies.

I also believe that DOE can improve this process on its own without congressional involvement. DOE testified at the legislative hearing on this bill that it has made numerous improvements to the process through its Part 10 process improvement plan. Further, DOE testified, and I quote, that the lengthiest part of the authorization process remains the time it takes partner countries to provide the required governmental nonproliferation assurances which can result in processing delays of 6 months to well over a year, unquote. So it seems as if the goal of this bill is to be more competitive by being less secure and that is troubling. I am not saying that is what you want, but that is my concern. And I understand the desire for predictable Part 810 review process. This is just not the right time, in my opinion, to possibly cut corners on oversight of these technologies and the potential for nuclear proliferation.

And I know that Mr. Johnson put up that chart. I don't know where it went. I don't know if we have to put it up again. But Mr. Johnson argued that China and Russia are dominating the global nuclear industry in exporting their technologies to more countries, but of course China and Russia do not have the stringent export and licensing policies like the U.S.

And once again it seems as if the goal of the bill is to

531

532

533

534

535

536

537

538

539

540

541

542

543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551

552

553

554

556	be more competitive I am concerned that we not be more competitive
557	by being less secure. That is what troubles me here. So I do
558	ask that my colleagues vote no on the legislation. I yield back,
559	Mr. Chairman, unless someone wants my time. I don't think so.
560	Thank you.
561	Mr. Upton. Other members wishing to speak on the bill?
562	Seeing none, no amendments being offered, the question now
563	occurs on forwarding the discussion draft to the full committee.
564	All those in favor will you ask for a roll call?
565	A roll call has been requested. The clerk will call the
566	roll. This will be on passage of the discussion draft.
567	The Clerk. Mr. Olson?
568	Mr. Olson. Aye.
569	The Clerk. Mr. Olson votes aye.
570	Mr. Barton?
571	Mr. Shimkus?
572	<u>Mr. Shimkus</u> . Aye.
573	The Clerk. Mr. Shimkus votes aye.
574	Mr. Latta?
575	<u>Mr. Latta</u> . Aye.
576	The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes aye.
577	Mr. Harper?
578	Mr. Harper. Aye.
579	The Clerk. Mr. Harper votes aye.
580	Mr. McKinley?

581	Mr. McKinley. Aye.
582	The Clerk. Mr. McKinley votes aye.
583	Mr. Kinzinger?
584	<u>Mr. Kinzinger</u> . Aye.
585	The Clerk. Mr. Kinzinger votes aye.
586	Mr. Griffith?
587	Mr. Griffith. Aye.
588	The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes aye.
589	Mr. Johnson?
590	Mr. Johnson. Aye.
591	The Clerk. Mr. Johnson votes aye.
592	Mr. Long?
593	Mr. Long. Aye.
594	The Clerk. Mr. Long votes aye.
595	Mr. Bucshon?
596	Mr. Bucshon. Aye.
597	The Clerk. Mr. Bucshon votes aye.
598	Mr. Flores?
599	Mr. Mullin?
600	Mr. Mullin. Aye.
601	The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.
602	Mr. Hudson?
603	Mr. Hudson. Aye.
604	The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes aye.
605	Mr. Cramer?

606	Mr. Cramer. Aye.
607	The Clerk. Mr. Cramer votes aye.
608	Mr. Walberg?
609	Mr. Walberg. Aye.
610	The Clerk. Mr. Walberg votes aye.
611	Mr. Duncan?
612	Mr. Duncan. Aye.
613	The Clerk. Mr. Duncan votes aye.
614	Chairman Walden?
615	Mr. Rush?
616	Mr. Rush. No.
617	The Clerk. Mr. Rush votes no.
618	Mr. McNerney?
619	Mr. McNerney. No.
620	The Clerk. Mr. McNerney votes no.
621	Mr. Peters?
622	Mr. Peters. No.
623	The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes no.
624	Mr. Green?
625	Mr. Green. No.
626	The Clerk. Mr. Green votes no.
627	Mr. Doyle?
628	Mr. Doyle. Yes.
629	The Clerk. Mr. Doyle votes aye.
630	Ms. Castor?
l l	· ·

631	Ms. Castor. No.
632	The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes no.
633	Mr. Sarbanes?
634	Mr. Sarbanes. No.
635	The Clerk. Mr. Sarbanes votes no.
636	Mr. Welch?
637	Mr. Welch. No.
638	The Clerk. Mr. Welch votes no.
639	Mr. Tonko?
640	<u>Mr. Tonko</u> . No.
641	The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes no.
642	Mr. Loebsack?
643	Mr. Loebsack. No.
644	The Clerk. Mr. Loebsack votes no.
645	Mr. Schrader?
646	Mr. Schrader. No.
647	The Clerk. Mr. Schrader votes no.
648	Mr. Kennedy?
649	Mr. Kennedy. No.
650	The Clerk. Mr. Kennedy votes no.
651	Mr. Butterfield?
652	Mr. Pallone?
653	Mr. Pallone. No.
654	The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes no.
655	Chairman Upton?
	1

	NEAL D. ODOCC
680	The Clerk. Mr. Flores votes aye.
679	Mr. Flores. Aye.
678	Oh, and Mr. Flores?
677	to get there. So on that the clerk will report 19 ayes, 13 noes.
676	Mr. Upton. It is not 2:00 in the morning nor is it going
675	The Clerk. Butterfield votes no.
674	is recorded as no.
673	Mr. Upton. Oh man, maybe you all right. Mr. Butterfield
672	Mr. Butterfield. No.
671	Oh, how is Butterfield recorded?
670	Mr. Upton. Thank you ayes.
669	and 12 noes.
668	The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 19 ayes
667	The clerk will report the tally.
666	Mr. Upton. Anybody else?
665	The Clerk. Chairman Walden votes aye.
664	The Chairman. Aye.
663	All right, seeing none how does Mr. Walden?
662	their vote?
661	Mr. Upton. Other members wishing to cast a vote or change
660	The Clerk. Mr. Barton votes aye.
659	Mr. Barton. Vote aye.
658	Mr. Upton. Vote Mr. Barton?
657	The Clerk. Chairman Upton votes aye.
656	Mr. Upton. Votes aye.

681	Mr. Upton. 20. I will let the clerk report now just to
682	make sure.
683	The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 20 ayes
684	and 13 noes.
685	Mr. Upton. 20 ayes, 13 noes. The bill is favorably
686	reported. The draft is favorably reported.
687	The chair will now call up H.R. 1320 and ask the clerk to
688	report.
689	[The Bill H.R. 1320 follows:]
690	
691	**************************************

692	The Clerk. H.R. 1320, to amend the Omnibus Budget
693	Reconciliation Act of 1990 related to Nuclear Regulatory
694	Commission user fees and annual charges and for other purposes.
695	Mr. Upton. Without objection, the first reading of the bill
696	is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment at any
697	point, so ordered. And Mr. Kinzinger and Doyle are seeking
698	recognition to offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.
699	Mr. Kinzinger. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the
700	desk.
701	[The amendment offered by Mr. Kinzinger follows:]
702	
703	**************************************

704

Mr. Upton. So the clerk will report.

705

An amendment in the nature of a substitute to The Clerk.

706

H.R. 1320 offered by Mr. Kinzinger.

707

Mr. Upton. And, without objection, the first reading, or

I am pleased to see this being included today, the NUKE Act,

708

it is considered as read and the gentleman from Illinois is

709

recognized for 5 minutes.

710

Mr. Kinzinger. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

711

712

which my colleague, Mike Doyle, and I have been working on for

713

well over a year including today, and I thank him for his help.

714

We have worked on this bill for so long because we both realize

715

that this is a pivotal moment for nuclear power. This is

716

technology that was invented in my home state of Illinois -- so,

717

you know, it makes us better than everybody else on that -- and

718

continues to provide my constituents with reliable, carbon-free

719

electricity.

720

not guaranteed and the consequences of continued early retirement

Unfortunately, the fate of our nation's nuclear fleet is

721 722

from the loss of good jobs to ceding our global leadership on

723

safety and nonproliferation are all too real. And as was

very different world than when the rules were written.

724

discussed on the prior bill, there are a lot of issues we have

725

to deal with in terms of continuing our world leadership in a

726

727

This legislation provides reasonable reforms to the Nuclear

728

Regulatory Commission to increase accountability, transparency,

and predictability in regulation. Reducing the regulatory burden on existing plants while still maintaining the NRC's gold standard of safety will make it easier for not only our current fleet of nuclear plants but also the next generation of nuclear to thrive.

This amendment makes several changes to H.R. 1320, many of which are based on technical feedback from the NRC and based on feedback from my colleagues on this committee. Specifically, this amendment extends several compliance and reporting dates to account for the passage of time since the bill was introduced in March of 2017. Further, section 8 is replaced with a sense of Congress to reflect the NRC's progress towards a rule on plant decommissioning.

With many licenses and local communities awaiting guidance from NRC on this process, the previous language would have further delayed this by requiring NRC to restart the rulemaking process. Additionally, based on concerns from Ranking Member Pallone during last month's hearing, the deadlines in section 7 have been modified to provide additional flexibility and recognition that unforeseen circumstances may arise to prevent those deadlines from being met.

I look forward to continuing to work with members on both sides of the aisle to further refine this bill. Overall, this amendment in the nature of a substitute provides improved clarity and additional flexibility in this great underlying bill. With

that I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment. And if Mr. Doyle wants my time or to claim his own I am happy to yield to him.

Mr. Doyle. I thank the gentleman. And I appreciate the opportunity to speak about the NUKE Act that I cosponsor with my colleague and friend Adam Kinzinger.

Nuclear energy provides nearly 40 percent of Pennsylvania's electricity and employs thousands of skilled workers in Pennsylvania. And despite being a carbon-free and reliable source of baseload power, the nuclear energy industry is facing pressure from a variety of factors such as increasing NRC fees and uncertainty in the export process. Addressing some of these issues will be necessary not only to protect jobs in Pennsylvania and across the country, but as well to meet our nation's climate goals.

I want to thank my colleague Adam Kinzinger for his leadership and work on the NUKE Act. This bipartisan legislation will take important steps to modernize the NRC's fee structure, set achievable and flexible timelines for application reviews, and look to future reforms that will ensure the NRC can continue to effectively protect public health and safety.

The bill addresses a serious reality facing the nuclear industry. As nuclear power plants retire, the remaining fleet will be faced with increasing fees from NRC. We need to support our existing nuclear plants while ensuring that the NRC is able

779 to fulfill its mission. I believe this legislation accomplishes And I would remind all of my colleagues that if 780 those goals. 781 we start to lose our nuclear portfolio in this country it will 782 be impossible to meet our climate change goals. So those of us that believe climate change is real and want 783 784 to see that problem addressed, we dare not continue to lose nuclear 785 facilities especially before their time. And that is why I think 786 this legislation is necessary and I support it and I thank Mr. 787 Kinzinger. I yield back.

> Mr. Kinzinger. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I yield back my time.

The gentleman yields back. Other members Mr. Upton. The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Pallone, wishing to speak? to strike the last word.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I appreciate Mr. Pallone. the efforts of my colleagues to address issues relating to the licensing of nuclear power reactors here in the U.S. H.R. 1320 makes a number of changes to the NRC budget process to the NRC budget process and fee structure and I do worry that several of the provisions could arbitrarily limit the resources the NRC needs and adversely affect its ability to do its job. I appreciate that several changes made in the amendment in the nature of a substitute give NRC more flexibility, but I still have concerns about limiting NRC's resources.

The bill also sets time limits for NRC to complete major

788

789

790

791

792

793

794

795

796

797

798

799

800

801

802

milestones in the licensing process. NRC is given 24 months to complete a draft environmental impact statement and 42 months to complete the technical review process. While this timeline may be realistic for most projects, it doesn't give the Commission the necessary flexibility, in my opinion, to take the time it may need to study relevant issues if it receives a more complex application.

As I said in my opening statement, I am also concerned with a provision requiring NRC to issue a construction permit for a nuclear facility even if an entity has filed a formal request for a hearing objecting to the project. The stakeholders have testified that it is already extremely difficult to intervene in the licensing process for a nuclear facility especially if you are not an expert.

So I don't think we should be limiting the opportunity for stakeholders to have their views heard in the licensing process. I am not able to support the bill if this provision remains when the bill is considered at the full committee. But my concerns aside, I do support making common sense changes to the NRC licensing process that can ease the pressure on the nuclear industry without jeopardizing safety or the environment. And I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. Other members wishing to speak? The gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. Welch. I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Mr. Kinzinger and Mr. Doyle for their work on this. I would like to speak briefly on a measure contained in the bill dealing with the nuclear plant decommissioning process. Vermont has a decommissioned nuclear plant more and more are going offline. There will be the issues that Mr. Doyle mentioned that we have to contend with, but one of the things that we have to focus on is the impact on the communities in the rulemaking process at the NRC.

The provision in the bill that I am speaking about, section 8 of INS contains a sense of Congress provision stating that a safe, effective, and efficient decommissioning process for nuclear reactors that supports the principles of good regulation including openness, clarity, and reliability is vital to all licensees and local communities and that the NRC should complete the final rulemaking in the next 18 months. I am very happy that that provision was included by Mr. Kinzinger and Mr. Doyle. The impact of the decommissioning on local communities is very significant.

As you know, the NRC is currently developing a draft regulatory guidance to determine how a nuclear plant decommissioning should unfold. We have regulation in place that is guiding the development of new nuclear reactors, but Vermont's experience with Vermont Yankee has shown that we lack a coherent structure on how reactors should be taken down after their useful life. And to that end this is an important rulemaking that I

was pleased to see the NRC update.

Yet I am concerned by the direction the NRC is heading. While the Commission appears to be inclined to use rulemaking to sign off on the nuclear industry's wish list of cost-saving measures such as streamlined safety exemptions, it fails to address the concerns of state and local communities across the country that are hosting nuclear reactors and want a seat at the table.

There are several specific concerns that I have with the current approach at the NRC, and other members who have plants that are going to go offline might share these: lack of state and local stakeholder involvement; questionable use of the decommissioning trust fund such as for spent fuel management; the reality that the use of safe stored decommissioning procedures will effectively delay a full cleanup and redevelopment of nuclear sites for decades; the reduction of emergency planning functions during periods when spent fuel remains in spent fuel pools.

It is apparent that the industry would like to narrow the scope of this rulemaking to only what they deem the most pressing matters. I believe we must push back on that. We are at a critical point that will shape how communities deal with decommissioning for decades. It is imperative that the NRC take a comprehensive approach to this that guarantees host communities a seat at the table.

I want to work with Mr. Kinzinger and Mr. Doyle to see if

879	we can build on section 8 in their bill of this legislation to
880	encourage NRC to address these issues as part of the rulemaking.
881	And I hope, Mr. Doyle and Mr. Kinzinger, we can work together
882	on that going forward. Thank you and I yield back.
883	Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. Other members
884	wishing to speak?
885	Seeing none, the vote occurs on the amendment in the nature
886	of a substitute. All those in favor will signify by saying aye.
887	Aye.
888	Those opposed, say no.
889	In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it. The amendment
890	in the nature of a substitute is agreed to.
891	The question now occurs are there further amendments?
892	Seeing none, the question now occurs on forwarding H.R. 1320,
893	as amended, to the full committee.
894	All those in favor will say aye. Aye.
895	Those opposed say no.
896	The ayes appear to have it. The ayes have it and the bill
897	is agreed to.
898	The chair now calls up H.R. 6140 and ask the clerk to report.
899	[The Bill H.R. 6140 follows:]
900	
901	**************************************

902 The Clerk. H.R. 6140, to require the Secretary of Energy to establish and carry out a program to support the availability 903 904 of high-assay, low-enriched uranium for domestic commercial use 905 and for other purposes. 906 Without objection, the first reading of the bill Mr. Upton. is dispensed with. 907 The bill will be open for amendment at any 908 point. 909 Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill? 910 Are there any amendments to the bill? 911 Mr. Flores. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. 912 The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes. Mr. Upton. 913 Mr. Flores. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 914 Most of today's nuclear reactors are very similar in nature 915 and they operate on a fuel that generally is enriched below five 916 The next generation of advanced reactors is currently percent. under development. However, they vary in size and operation and 917 918 they will need greater flexibility and efficiencies from an 919 This fuel is known as high-assay, low-enriched advanced fuel. 920 uranium or HA-LEU for short, and it is enriched at higher levels 921 than what is currently available in the commercial market. 922 The Bipartisan Advanced Nuclear Fuel Availability Act, which 923 I introduced with my friend Mr. McNerney, establishes a 924 public-private partnership through the Energy Department's 925 Office of Nuclear Energy to support the availability of 926 high-assay, low-enriched uranium for domestic commercial use.

This bill as introduced also includes updates to the discussion draft from last month's legislative hearing including, first, a clarification that members of the consortium may include entities involved in any state of the nuclear fuel cycle; second, that the applicability of secretarial determinations on uranium transfers will be set; and third, it incorporates other technical feedback.

A March 2017 survey of 18 U.S.-based advanced nuclear developers found that a lack of availability of advanced fuel is the foremost factor that would impede the development and deployment of advanced nuclear technologies. Simply put, this bill would ensure that there is a robust supply of advanced fuel available for the domestic commercial industry to purchase for the advanced nuclear reactors of tomorrow.

I want to again thank my friend Mr. McNerney for working with me on this bill and I look forward to seeing H.R. 6140 advance to the full committee for consideration. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. Other members wishing -- the gentleman from California, Mr. McNerney, to strike the last word.

Mr. McNerney. Strike the last word. I thank the chairman and ranking member for bringing this legislation to the committee and I am glad to work with Mr. Flores to advance nuclear technology. We need a diverse energy mix and nuclear energy

952 provides a zero carbon emission electricity. The availability 953 of high-assay, low-enriched uranium is critical to these efforts. 954 Federal investments and protocols regarding the 955 transportation, fuel fabrication, and enrichment to effectively 956 bring this fuel to the market are encouraging. Small modular 957 reactors, or SMRs, will be useful in a variety of settings and 958 this type of fuel needs to be available by the time SMRs are more 959 widely available. The consortium that is formed here is the type 960 of partnership that will be useful in kickstarting this industry 961 and then turning it over to let industry take the reins. 962 However, I do have some proliferation concerns that still 963 need to be addressed. I am glad to see the authorizing language 964 included here that was not included in the previous discussion 965 draft. I look forward to working with my colleague Mr. Flores 966 in moving this legislation along through the committee and on to the floor to help us meet our nation's complex energy and 967 968 environmental needs. I yield back. 969 Mr. Upton. The gentleman yields back. Other members 970 wishing to speak? 971 Seeing none, the question now occurs in forwarding H.R. 6140 972 to the full committee. 973 All those in favor will say aye. Aye. 974 Those opposed, say no. 975 In the opinion of the chair the ayes have it. The bill is 976 forwarded to the full committee.

	42
977	The chair calls up now H.R. 6141 and asks the clerk to report.
978	[The Bill H.R. 6141 follows:]
979	
980	**************************************

981	The Clerk. H.R. 6141, to require the Secretary of Energy
982	to develop a report on the pilot program to site, construct, and
983	operate microreactors at critical national security locations
984	and for other purposes.
985	Mr. Upton. Without objection, the first reading of the bill
986	is dispensed with. The bill will be open for amendment at any
987	point.
988	Are there any bipartisan amendments to the bill?
989	Are there any amendments to the bill?
990	Seeing none, the question now occurs on forwarding H.R. 6141
991	to the full committee.
992	All those in favor will say aye. Aye.
993	Those opposed, say no.
994	In the opinion of the chair the ayes have it and the bill
995	is favorably reported.
996	So I would like to recognize one of our counsels on the Energy
997	Subcommittee staff, Jason Stanek. After spending 15 years at
998	FERC, Jason joined the staff last year. He has done tremendous
999	work on electricity issues, particularly with our Empowering
1000	America series. He is leaving us tomorrow. He has been
1001	appointed as the chairman of the Maryland Public Utility
1002	Commission.
1003	Mr. Sarbanes, he is a guy that you well know, so.
1004	[Applause.]
1005	Mr. Upton. It is well deserved. We know that he has a

wonderful background. We look forward to working with him in the days and months ahead. Best of luck, you are great. Thank you.

And with that, without objection, the staff is authorized to make technical and conforming changes to the legislation approved by the subcommittee today, so ordered. And, without objection, the subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:53 a.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

1009

1010

1011

1012