Ray Imel

After 75 years of searching, there is still no long term storage solution for spent rods or waste from the generation of nuclear energy. It looks unwise to push the technology forward without solving this existential fact. I wish the State of Alaska would have the resources it needs to manage some of the risks involved in the testing of the first generation of these products, but can't envision a legislature willing to fund it adequately. Do we want to be the guinea pigs? This project requires a lot of attention and focus, two things critically missing in our current political environment. 'It wasn't as bad as we thought' said no one ever when things went wrong at earlier nuclear accidents. And 'The solution to storage of waste is just around the corner' Rings hollow after so many years. Just like my Boomer parents said: 'Clean up the mess you made with your old toys, before you get out any new toys.' Even the proponents of the reactors can't come up with economics that pencil out to anything but 'boondoggle'. The current practice is to store waste on site. So please include that in your considerations and while vitrification and stainless steel technology is either 'promising' or 'discouraging' You must also consider the impacts up to a 1000 years from us on Alaskans. The vitrified radioactive wastes aren't safe then, their containment has just degraded by then. It appears the Air Force has arranged for the vendor to assume responsibility for waste and decommissioning as well as training and supplying operators. Siting protections for Alaskans should include a bond held until after the sites are cleaned up and restored, to ensure the State is not on the hook in the event of changes in the corporate world. The 'known unknowns' are sobering. If the spent micro-reactors are to be left on site- after 10-40 years, the bond should include security costs to prevent bad actors from accessing the carcass. The unknown unknowns? Really, this seems like a much bigger risk than a runaway windmill, or heat pump. Funny that the same group worried about the environmental cost of batteries-it seems so cynical- is so quiet about uranium mining. NEI's (https://nei.org/resources/reports-briefs/cost-competitiveness-micro-reactors-remote-markets) cost comparison report indicates there are at least 12 competing manufacturers and designs each of which should trigger siting considerations unique to their design, operation and lifespans. I know we have to have an 'all hands on deck approach' to solving global warming, This seems like a boss level challenge to get right. I appreciate your work.