

## Douglas Franklin

I support the use of microreactors in Alaska, with a few reservations. Microreactors have the potential to reduce dependence on fossil fuels, improve air quality, and provide bountiful energy to remote communities while lowering their carbon footprint; all good things. It is exciting to imagine how a remote community could blossom given access to clean, inexpensive energy, especially if that were coupled with a robust fiber optic network.

My reservations are around total lifecycle cost and long term operations. It would be tragic to install a microreactor that cannot be subsequently maintained and refueled because it was funded on a short-term project basis. My sense is that many of the communities that could benefit the most from microreactors are struggling financially. Will they be able to pay for maintenance, and when the time comes years after installation, refueling? If the answer is 'no,' then who pays the bill? Is there funding set aside to build the industries, like arctic data centers, that could finance long term operations? These issues should be thought through and addressed before replacing one dependency with another.

That said, I understand that sometimes you have to take the first step, and trust that you will be able to figure out the next, in order to get anywhere. So I do support microreactors, but I urge thinking through the bigger picture to make sure they are not stranded in the future.