

## Dan Cannon

The entire lifecycle of nuclear energy production is expensive, destructive, and deadly. As the Union of Concerned Scientists noted in their recent report evaluating modern nuclear technologies, including micronuclear reactors: "Advanced" Isn't Always Better.

Some specific concerns I have that I hope will be addressed:

1. Look to the future, especially decommissioning plans (the process and cost)
2. Insurance. If something terrible were to happen, who's paying, and how are these communities protected/compensated? Is the State on the Line? The Companies? What is the "clean up plan" and what are the challenges of cleaning up the radioactive site in Alaska's weather realities?
3. Ongoing Maintenance and/or monitoring: It's one thing for a federally funded, well-staffed, conveniently located, and resourced military base to use this technology. I'm not saying people in places such as remote Arctic villages can not or should not be trained, but the State should seriously consider the cost associated with training, resources available to those communities, and access and/or ease of getting needed materials.
4. Let's be honest; the State doesn't have the best record and/or policy in place related to consultation (communities and/or tribes). I would encourage the state to spend significant resources on providing community members with all of the available information (Pros and Cons). I'd also encourage the State to follow the United Nations UNDRIP FPIC procedures and ensure communities have the right to say "no".
5. Climate Change Impact Studies - I'd like to encourage the state to push the companies offering this technology to do significant tests related to permafrost melt.