

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 SPENT FUEL SOLUTIONS WEBINAR: GOVERNING
9 LONG PROMISES: THE LONG ARC OF U.S. SPENT FUEL
10 POLICY

11 Via Zoom

12 TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

13 September 10, 2026
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 SPENT FUEL SOLUTIONS WEBINAR: GOVERNING LONG
2 PROMISES: THE LONG ARC OF U.S. SPENT FUEL POLICY
3
4
5
6
7
8

9 Transcript of video-recording meeting via Zoom
10 commencing at 8 a.m., Thursday, September 10, 2026.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

WEBINAR SPEAKERS:

JESSICA LUTERNAUER - (COALITION MANAGER OF SPENT
FUEL SOLUTIONS)

VINCENT IALENTI - (ANTHROPOLOGIST AND FORMER SENIOR
PROGRAM MANAGER AT THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S [DOE]
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR ENERGY)

1 Via Zoom, Thursday, September 10, 2026

2
3 JESSICA LUTERNAUER: Good morning, everyone.

4 Welcome, and thank you for joining us.

5 My name is Jessica Luternauer, and I'm the
6 Coalition Manager of Spent Fuel Solutions, or SFS.

7 Since we were formed in 2021, we've advocated for
8 federally licensed off-site storage and disposal
9 facilities for used nuclear fuel from commercial
10 reactors.

11 Over the past 5 years, we have supported the
12 Department of Energy's consent and collaboration-based
13 siting processes.

14 And now, we're very excited to see the proposed
15 Nuclear Lifecycle Innovation Campus initiative take
16 shape.

17 As many of you know, in July, the DOE announced the
18 selection of 5 finalist states after receiving 28
19 applications from 26 states.

20 This announcement followed a request for
21 information that was issued in response to President
22 Trump's Executive Order 14302, on Reinvigorating the
23 Nuclear Industrial Base, which was issued in May 2025.

24 The finalist states are Idaho, Louisiana, Oklahoma,
25 Tennessee, and Utah, and just yesterday, we learned that

1 a sixth state, West Virginia, has been added to the list.

2 This is really exciting because it's the first time
3 that states have raised their hands to explore hosting
4 used nuclear fuel disposal.

5 The campuses would also support a variety of
6 activities that can deliver economic diversification and
7 well-paying jobs.

8 Some of those activities include fuel fabrication,
9 enrichment, and reprocessing.

10 As we eagerly await the next steps in this process,
11 we remain committed to our core policy principles and
12 changes to the Nuclear Waste Policy Act that would enable
13 the Nuclear Lifecycle Innovation Campuses to move
14 forward.

15 These principles include forming a single-purpose
16 entity to manage the spent fuel program, providing
17 reliable funding for this entity, eliminating the
18 exclusivity of Yucca Mountain, and modifying the linkage
19 between consolidated storage and a repository.

20 While the used fuel landscape has changed, these
21 needs have not.

22 Today, we're here to talk about some of the recent
23 changes and how they fit into the long history of the
24 U.S. spent fuel management program.

25 We're pleased to welcome Vincent Talenti, a nuclear

1 anthropologist, to talk about how these policy shifts fit
2 into the bigger picture and where they might lead.

3 Vincent is currently a senior researcher at Tampere
4 University in Finland.

5 He previously served as Senior Program Manager from
6 2022 to 2025 in the DOE's Office of Nuclear Energy, where
7 he led the Consent-Based Siting Consortia.

8 His research explores long-term environmental
9 security and energy policy, nuclear expert culture, and
10 how institutions navigate the long and uncertain
11 timelines of nuclear issues.

12 Please join me in welcoming Vincent.

13 He's going to make a presentation, followed by a
14 Q&A.

15 We did receive a few questions in advance, which we
16 will try to get to, and of course, as always, if you
17 have any additional questions, please do leave them in
18 the chat.

19 We will do our best to get to all questions if time
20 permits.

21 So with that, I'd like to welcome Vincent and ask,
22 before we dive into the presentation, if you can please
23 just give us a brief overview of your nuclear journey and
24 how you came to work in the nuclear space.

25 VINCENT IALENTI: Sure thing.

1 So, happy to, thank you, Jessica, for having me.

2 Great to see everyone here.

3 I see some familiar names in the participants list.

4 So, as some of you know, I started in a peculiar
5 way, I believe, in the nuclear world.

6 I started not as a nuclear engineer, not as a
7 nuclear physicist, I started as an anthropologist.

8 So my first entry came through my Ph.D. field
9 research, which I conducted at Cornell University.

10 I had a National Science Foundation grant to spend
11 3 years living in Finland, where I currently reside.

12 And I conducted fieldwork, ethnographic fieldwork,
13 among the country's nuclear waste repository safety case
14 experts.

15 I recorded 121 interviews between 2012 and 2014.

16 And that research became the foundation of my first
17 book, which is called Deep Time Reckoning.

18 And MIT Press published Deep Time Reckoning in
19 2020.

20 And it's based on fieldwork that explored how the
21 Onkalo nuclear waste repository safety experts grappled
22 with the limits of knowledge as they made systems
23 analysis models of distant future societies, bodies,
24 ecosystems, glacial ice sheets, seismic activity, other
25 geophysical phenomena across tens of thousands or even

1 hundreds of thousands of years.

2 So, after I finished that study, I moved to George
3 Washington University in DC at the Elliott School, served
4 as a MacArthur assistant research professor there for a
5 few years, and started studying accidents, the
6 organizational, financial, and socio-political drivers to
7 transuranic waste drum breach accidents, in DOE's
8 environmental management complex.

9 I find myself on the other side of the nuclear
10 waste problem.

11 I joined DOE as a social scientist and program
12 manager, find myself a few years after that, serving as
13 federal manager of the Consent-Based Siting Consortia, as
14 Jessica mentioned.

15 And that was a nationwide network of 12 project
16 teams that spans universities, nonprofits, private
17 sector, other organizations.

18 I also oversaw sort of a suite of communications
19 and social research work across five national
20 laboratories when I was at DOE.

21 And when I was at DOE, I actually found myself
22 implementing, many of the same sort of Nordic-style
23 consent-based siting ideas I first encountered in
24 Finland, a decade earlier when I was an anthropologist.

25 So in short, my nuclear journey sort of weaves back

1 and forth between studying nuclear institutions from the
2 outside, trying to make them work in the inside, back and
3 forth.

4 So right now, I'm actually back in Finland, going
5 full circle.

6 I'm actually have a Angry Birds mug representing
7 Finland, their greatest cultural export from circa, I
8 guess, 2013 or so.

9 So I'm back in Finland, and I'm in academia, for a
10 few years, perhaps, we'll see.

11 And... I'm doing policy research on what, what makes
12 some nuclear waste programs earn trust for the long term,
13 and others kind of succumb to programmatic instability in
14 political term... turnover, across different
15 administrations in other places.

16 So that's my winding road to how I landed in this
17 webinar today, I believe.

18 JESSICA LUTERNAUER: Thank you.

19 With that, do you want to jump into the
20 presentation?

21 VINCENT IALENTI: I do. Can you see my slides? Is
22 that all set up?

23 JESSICA LUTERNAUER: Yes.

24 VINCENT IALENTI: Okay.

25 Yes, so yeah, thanks again for having me, and today

1 I'm going to pull a lot of different writings and ideas
2 and thoughts I have, in different places together, and
3 tell a story about unkept promises about institutional
4 misalignments and the possibility for future spent fuel
5 solutions.

6 I'm gonna put the U.S. nuclear policy pivots we've
7 seen in recent months into three broader contexts.

8 First, the Trump administration's Nuclear Lifecycle
9 Innovation Campus model.

10 Second, the erosion of independent nuclear
11 regulatory oversight.

12 And third, the revived push for spent fuel
13 reprocessing and recycling.

14 I'm gonna give credit where credit's due, but I'm
15 also going to flag some current trends that, if they're
16 not carefully navigated, could, in my view, generate some
17 glowing nuclear energy enthusiasm in the short term,
18 while derailing substantive nuclear waste progress for
19 the long term.

20 So, before we get started on that, let me give a
21 quick disclaimer.

22 Everything I'm saying here today is my own view as
23 a researcher.

24 It's based entirely on the public record.

25 If you want to hear what DOE has to say about these

1 issues, there's a recent webinar with Marla Morales and
2 ANS, that is the official word, as far as I'm concerned,
3 the recent one.

4 And nothing I say today is meant to represent the
5 views of my previous employer, the Department of Energy,
6 or Tampere University or Spent Fuel Solutions.

7 So this is Vincent, speaking today.

8 That's a nice disclaimer, and now we launch into
9 the first slide.

10 Here it is.

11 So, let's start with the problem at the heart of it
12 all.

13 I've been calling it spent fuel's quadruple bind.

14 The first bind is about community consent.

15 Spent Fuel stranded at more than 35 states, across
16 more than 70 locations.

17 Communities never agreed to host it indefinitely.

18 And every new siting effort, in the United States,
19 begins in the shadow of broken commitments from previous
20 years.

21 A second bind, the quadruple bind, is statutory.

22 The Nuclear Waste Policy Act, as amended, restricts
23 the siting of a repository to one location, Yucca
24 Mountain in Nye County, Nevada.

25 The Act also bars federal consolidated storage

1 until the NRC first issues a license for a final
2 repository.

3 Third bind is about misaligned governance
4 architecture.

5 So, the U.S. spent fuel program, is housed in DOE's
6 Office of Nuclear Energy, which has a mandate to promote
7 reactor innovation and commercial deployment, which is
8 great.

9 But it does mean that U.S. nuclear waste progress
10 tends to advance only insofar as it doesn't disrupt
11 prevailing industrial priorities attached to nuclear
12 energy expansion.

13 The fourth bind is about financial disincentive.

14 So DOE failed to deliver a repository in 1998,
15 created a costly system of taxpayer-funded
16 reimbursements.

17 This crowd knows the story well.

18 Reimbursements go to utilities for storing the
19 waste.

20 So, there's this liability regime that's created,
21 political economy of U.S. nuclear waste changes, and it
22 changes in ways that haven't necessarily favored the
23 resolution of this stalemate in any rapid, or efficient
24 way.

25 So, for some, the low-visibility status quo of

1 taxpayer-funded, decentralized storage seems a lot easier
2 to live with than a renewed sort of national fight, or
3 trans-regional fight over where the waste goes, how it
4 gets there, et cetera, et cetera.

5 So the outcome of this quadruple bind is something
6 I've been calling, in my writings.

7 It's a condition of managed immobility.

8 It's a fragmentary, scattered, dry storage system
9 that's costly, it's redundant, it lacks both public
10 consent and a place for the waste to go.

11 So now, let's look at... the Nuclear Lifecycle
12 Innovation Campus plan.

13 The campuses would be regional hubs, as Jessica
14 mentioned, for co-locating fuel fabrication, enrichment,
15 reprocessing, and or waste disposition facilities.

16 So the main course as is said, is, the waste
17 disposition, etc.

18 But these campuses could also include other
19 facilities, such as reactors, they could include data
20 centers, to help sort of incentivize, siting.

21 So by bundling nuclear fuel management into this
22 larger economic development package, DOE invited states
23 to compete for waste facilities that were long
24 considered, politically untenable on their own, right?

25 So... and this resulted in 5 governors at the

1 negotiating table, after decades of political stalemate.

2 And this is a serious achievement, as Jessica
3 mentioned, so we should all be very happy, that the ball
4 is moving.

5 We're seeing Utah and Tennessee express openness to
6 a geologic repository, or at least discussing it, in
7 writing.

8 I'm hearing that other states were interested as
9 well.

10 And it's interesting, because repository didn't
11 even appear in DOE's solicitation.

12 I wasn't getting my hopes up.

13 That was framed around used fuel disposition rather
14 than a repository, and DOE left room for states to
15 propose other sorts of solutions as well, right?

16 So they could have... included decentralized deep
17 borehole disposal, or it could include spent fuel
18 reprocessing facilities.

19 Also of note, there's other changes going on, too.
20 If you look at DOE's 2027 budget, it no longer talks only
21 about repositories or, you know, or consolidated interim
22 storage.

23 It's also talking about staging facilities that
24 could serve as sort of intermediary logistical nodes for
25 receiving fuel, sending it onwards, sort of a conduit

1 point for receiving fuel, and then sending it onward to a
2 repository, to a reprocessing facility, or to a
3 consolidated interim storage facility.

4 So this is a political breakthrough.

5 So what's the broader context around this?

6 Well... first and foremost, it's a really large-scale
7 vision, perhaps too large.

8 In January, DOE invited... offered a hypothetical
9 scenario where one campus employed 50,000 direct workers,
10 generated 100,000 to 150,000 indirect jobs, and required
11 10,000, or 20,000 new housing units.

12 So that's the word in January.

13 In that same document, very oddly, they put
14 America's entire existing nuclear workforce at 80,000
15 people.

16 By January, however, DOE, or July, rather, DOE was
17 projecting only 25,000 jobs per campus.

18 So, as a social scientist, I'm pretty curious about
19 the methodology behind these ever-changing numbers, and
20 where they're coming from, and what the actual numbers
21 will be, if and when the campuses take root.

22 Second, the campus plan operates on a strikingly
23 aggressive timeline.

24 In a recent webinar, DOE's Nuclear Waste Chief
25 offered some reassurances to those of us who think going

1 slow to go fast is the best way.

2 She said, community engagement's gonna move at the
3 speed of public trust.

4 DOE's aggressive schedule is about the Nuclear
5 Waste Policy Act and legislative change, not about
6 rushing community buy-in.

7 And third, that DOE is not building something
8 tomorrow or next year.

9 So that is reassuring, because I've been said in
10 recent op-eds that I wrote in The Hill, also wrote one
11 for Washington Post that came out, you can Google these
12 and read them, nuclear facilities can't be licensed on a
13 ribbon-cutting schedule.

14 So... that's reassuring.

15 But this is an obvious tension with other
16 statements the department has made elsewhere, right?

17 So, in January, DOE said in an official document,
18 and this is verbatim, and you would assume that official
19 documents have to go through all sorts of checks, one
20 would assume, that it envisions, these campuses would be,
21 quote, deployed quickly, with initial facilities online,
22 that's facilities online in the 2027 timeframe.

23 If this happens, I will be impressed and surprised.

24 It also expressed a preference to get states
25 competing for offering more ambitious timescales to DOE,

1 so it asked them to offer pathways for, quote, regulatory
2 streamlining and expedited permitting.

3 Third, and this is something I think we really have
4 to pay attention to moving forward, the nuclear campus
5 plan has really undefined project-specific financial
6 structures.

7 These could come together in the coming months.

8 This project's moving fast, I'm not saying it
9 should move faster.

10 But let's think about this a little bit, right?

11 So we have the Nuclear Waste Fund, and that could
12 be available for repositories, for storage, associated
13 activities.

14 But DOE has been saying that, private investment
15 has to be the cornerstone of the financing, supported by
16 state and local contributions.

17 So, the solicitation gives states just 9 weeks, to
18 propose these funding approaches.

19 And DOE tells the states, that they should look to,
20 venture firms, technology companies, investment funds,
21 you know, industry partners, private equity companies,
22 and other, sort of, private sector partners for
23 financing.

24 And the numbers are staying ambitious, right?

25 So in July, DOE projected each campus attracts \$50

1 billion, or up to \$50 billion in capital investment.

2 So, if there's 3 campuses, which is a number that
3 people are saying up to 3 campuses, that is \$150 billion
4 of private capital investment.

5 So, we have to start thinking about... I am eagerly
6 anticipating getting a little more granularity about
7 where that money's coming from.

8 So, on the government side, the solicitation said
9 DOE support would be limited to the near term, to cost
10 sharing, to loan guarantees, to grants, to cooperative
11 agreements, and Defense Production Act mechanisms.

12 But none of that is currently locked in right now,
13 so we have to be in wait-and-see mode.

14 I think that's the right mode to be in right now,
15 before we have to suspend judgment, and be in wait-and-
16 see mode.

17 So that being said, August 10th, DOE publishes this
18 Defense Production Act, Nuclear Fuel Cycle Consortium
19 Plan, right?

20 And it directs a committee to design an advanced
21 fuel availability program for reprocessed, nuclear
22 materials, right?

23 And it seeks to evaluate, whether to use
24 congressional appropriations, or... and this should... raise
25 some eyebrows, potentially accrued interest from the

1 Nuclear Waste Fund to capitalize the reprocessing aspects
2 of the program.

3 So if you're in industry and you don't necessarily
4 think it's a great idea to, use accrued interest from the
5 Nuclear Waste Fund for reprocessing, then you might want
6 to check out that program.

7 So as of now, what we're looking at is, in my view,
8 a very exciting proposal, a somewhat visionary proposal.

9 But something that's ultimately very uncertain,
10 right?

11 We have these ambitious, hypothetical economic
12 development numbers.

13 We have these fast-track timelines, and that are
14 just starting to collide with the adults in the room
15 telling people the realities of construction licensing.

16 I imagine I have no evidence for that, but it seems
17 like now that it's starting to collide with the realities
18 of licensing and construction.

19 And... We have these unconfirmed financing
20 structures, exposed, to future market volatility.

21 So, we should not be afraid to ask in these
22 circumstances whether the nuclear campus plan is a strong
23 multi-generational framework, which it, for development,
24 which it totally could be, or it could be an overextended
25 political vision.

1 And its main function is to sort of drum up a mood
2 of collective excitement and enthusiasm for, you know,
3 energy dominance, or, you know, milestones of winning and
4 whatever is going on with the current administration.

5 So make no mistake, I hope this succeeds, I hope
6 DOE succeeds, I hope nuclear succeeds.

7 And I actually think... in essence, the nuclear
8 campus model is a rather brilliant idea... well, good idea.

9 Clustering... industrial clustering is a great way to
10 add efficiencies.

11 But if the rhetoric starts getting ahead of the
12 results, then we risk repeating a familiar cycle of over-
13 promising and disappointment that's defined U.S. spent
14 fuel policy for decades now.

15 So, that brings me to a second reason we should
16 approach all of this with caution, sort of guarded in a
17 guarded way.

18 And this has to do with the weakening independence
19 of federal nuclear expert oversight under the Trump
20 administration.

21 So, anyone who's worked in nuclear or high-hazard
22 spaces knows that good safety culture holds, that moments
23 of collective enthusiasm, you know, those moments where
24 people are all excited and caution becomes unfashionable.

25 It's precisely the moment we gotta start asking

1 tough questions about risk.

2 And this is especially the case when there's lots
3 of schedule pressure, and especially, especially,
4 especially the case when there's excitement about
5 schedule pressure, which is what we have now.

6 So here, let's distinguish between two different
7 types of nuclear deregulation, right?

8 So, one type of deregulation updates an old
9 rulebook for new technologies.

10 The 2024 Advance Act is that kind.

11 I support it.

12 The other erodes the technical rigor and
13 independence of institutions that make nuclear safety
14 decisions credible in the first place.

15 And by now, that pattern is kind of, unfortunately,
16 getting hard to miss.

17 So in early 2025, DOGE thinned out expert ranks
18 across DOE, across the NRC, across the EPA.

19 It did this not through performance reviews or
20 carefully cutting based on people's progress, did this
21 based on buyouts, attrition, dismissal, the whole thing
22 happened in a very small amount of time.

23 Probationary staff, etc, left.

24 So now, this massive project, people would be
25 surprised to know whenever I tell them this, DOE's Office

1 of Spent Fuel and High-Level Waste Disposition now has
2 just 13 people in it.

3 So think about the scale of the project, and think
4 of how there's only 13 people in that office, I believe,
5 and maybe 14 if you count the, acting DAS.

6 In May 2025, the Trump administration directed the
7 NRC to accelerate licensing for reactors and fix
8 deadlines, while simultaneously ordering it to lay off
9 workers.

10 In June, Trump removed an NRC commissioner years
11 before his term expired, Christopher Hansen, in a show of
12 political strength.

13 So, the White House dismissed all but one member of
14 the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, which offered
15 independent oversight, when I was at DOE, for instance.

16 And in June, this vulnerability to political
17 pressure actually grew more.

18 We thought this part of the Trump administration
19 was dying down, but it actually grew.

20 The Supreme Court held that officials wielding
21 executive power are removable at will, in a ruling that
22 concerned the FTC, the Federal Trade Commission.

23 But the ruling cast doubt on the constitutionality
24 of statutes protecting Nuclear Regulatory Commission
25 folks, commissioners, from being fired without cause.

1 Justice Sotomayor, even warned in her dissent,
2 explicitly singled out the NRC as being exposed to
3 political interference, due to this ruling.

4 And so that's happening over here, and then also
5 over here, we're seeing safety protections being pared
6 back, right?

7 So in February, DOE establishes a categorical
8 exclusion, allowing advanced reactor projects to proceed
9 without full environmental review.

10 The NRC reports that DOE cut roughly 750 pages,
11 from, sorry, NPR reported this, in an article that came
12 out, 750 pages from, the safety and security directives
13 governing the reactor pilot program.

14 And in July, the NRC proposed deleting Alara, as
15 low as reasonably achievable, in favor of a threshold-
16 based graded approach.

17 So, let me be clear about this. Some of those
18 things that I just mentioned might be defensible on
19 technical grounds individually.

20 A longer rulebook for the nuclear industry is not
21 necessarily a safer rulebook for the nuclear industry.

22 But, when they're unfolding together, amidst
23 thinned expert oversight in the institutions, collective
24 exuberance for deployment speed, this is a lot more than
25 just normal, standard regulatory modernization for new

1 advanced reactor technologies.

2 Now... none of this makes an accident inevitable, but
3 it could make one more likely.

4 I've studied accidents anthropologically, so I'd
5 like to flag that.

6 At Boeing, investigators tied two fatal 737 MAX
7 crashes to pressures to accelerate production and safety
8 review processes that lost their independence.

9 Very similar to what I just described.

10 And I flag this because I want the nuclear
11 renaissance to succeed.

12 Even a really minor accident, could stoke fears big
13 enough to derail What's being built right now.

14 And if you see how quickly the tides can turn on a
15 local level, just look at the AI data center siting
16 politics on both sides of the spectrum in a lot of, sort
17 of, grassroots opposition campaigns.

18 So, here I ask, I don't think we should, you know...
19 I'll ask, should we really go all in on the idea that
20 this administration's nuclear judgment, is somehow
21 way more mature or cordoned off, or separate from how
22 it's handling, say, the Iran war, its trade war with
23 Canada, it's efforts to meddle with the upcoming
24 election?

25 I learned today we get \$5,000 if we vote for the

1 Republicans or whatever.

2 So, we can't compartmentalize the nuclear program
3 off from these things, because it's all part of this one
4 big organic apparatus.

5 So compartmentalizing does us no favors.

6 I think Congress needs to demand a little more
7 detail, to check the realism of the \$150 billion
8 investments the three campuses would supposedly attract,
9 and make sure that, the DOE, whatever new office it's
10 gonna build, is properly equipped in order to implement
11 this, historic and path-breaking mission.

12 So now let's take a step back.

13 I singled out the Trump administration, but across
14 administrations, the U.S. nuclear waste gridlock has been
15 staged and restaged through these shifting partisan
16 vocabularies.

17 We had an environmental justice nuclear waste
18 program under Biden.

19 We have energy dominance under Trump.

20 It's cast and recast through these ever-changing
21 siting frameworks, right?

22 So we get to decide-announce-defend, consent-based
23 siting, collaboration-based siting, and now state-led
24 competition.

25 So we see policy reversals, we see back-and-forth

1 political whiplash, start-stop governance.

2 You know, go back to 2002, you have Bush
3 administration saying Yucca Mountain is sound science.

4 2009, Obama's cutting nearly all funding for it.

5 DOE launches a consent-based siting initiative
6 under Obama.

7 Trump shelves it, Biden revives it, but now for an
8 interim storage, consolidated interim storage facility.

9 Now consent-based siting is collaboration-based
10 siting, then it's sidelined, kind of, for nuclear
11 campuses under Trump.

12 So, each administration introduces these new
13 visions before the prior ones really had a chance to
14 mature or work or not work.

15 So, for example, when Trump returned to office last
16 year, the Biden administration's 2023 consent-based
17 siting process, you can find it online, the roadmap
18 stopped before Stage 2.

19 We're seeing an entirely new plan that punts a lot
20 of the community consent questions to the states.

21 I'm not saying that's good or bad, necessarily, I'm
22 just saying that the long-term effect of repeatedly
23 rebranding something that, ironically is planning for
24 decades, centuries, millennia, signals to communities
25 that federal assurances might actually be a little more

1 provisional in the short term, and it might be say, you
2 know, is this just gonna change again in a few years from
3 now?

4 So that brings us to another big change, big policy
5 pivot.

6 So, in April, you have DOE launching two parallel,
7 also, ambitious private sector initiatives.

8 One invites companies to propose facilities to
9 design, build, and operate, recycling, reprocessing, and
10 fuel fabrication facilities.

11 The other is seeking a commercial-scale,
12 demonstration facility at the INTEC site in Idaho, to
13 recycle defense-related fuel, from the ATR, the Advanced
14 Test Reactor, and etc.

15 We're seeing the House Energy and Commerce
16 Committee recently advance the Nuclear Refuel Act, to the
17 full House.

18 So that's the goal of that, would be to sort of
19 revise the Nuclear Energy Act to simplify a licensing
20 pathway for reprocessing.

21 And I recently learned from, from a public
22 presentation that, all five nuclear campus finalist
23 states are actively interested in hosting repository
24 facilities.

25 And it's also increasingly being said that DOE, is

1 looking to design its final disposal concepts, around the
2 waste streams that are, sort of emerge from reprocessing.

3 So, reprocessing is ascendant in ways we haven't
4 seen in a long time.

5 So what do we make of all of this?

6 Well, first is the fundamental fact of the matter
7 that... there's real value in spent nuclear fuel, right?

8 So, reprocessing can take it out, use the value for
9 other things, rather than throwing it in the ground.

10 Reprocessing could reduce dependence on uranium
11 supply chains and enrichment services controlled by
12 untrusted foreign partners as well.

13 However, history has shown, that tapping this
14 untapped value brings liabilities of its own, and it's
15 important to have those in mind.

16 Enormous costs, public support, nuclear weapons
17 proliferation risks and new streams of radioactive waste.

18 Every country that's pursued reprocessing finds
19 itself needing a mined repository.

20 And a once-through fuel cycle, you know, fresh
21 uranium in, direct disposal out, has remained more
22 affordable for quite a while now.

23 But, if we're going in this direction, we have to
24 make sure we don't, repeat the mistakes of the past,
25 right?

1 So, I'm gonna do my job from the sidelines and
2 point out some cautionary signals, we should all digest
3 before we hop on board immediately with reprocessing.

4 Look at the UK.

5 They separated plutonium at Sellafield,
6 anticipating fast breeder reactors that were never built
7 at scale.

8 Fuel they made, right, corrodes when left in water.

9 So the plant actually had to keep running just to
10 consume the fuel that was designed to feed it.

11 So it's become this kind of classic case study in
12 institutional lock-in.

13 And now you have the UK reprocessing ending, you
14 know, I mean, around 2018, this stuff started to close
15 down, and Britain was left with one of the world's
16 largest stockpiles of separated civil plutonium, non-
17 proliferation risks, and a cleanup project, costing tens
18 of billions of pounds.

19 So then, there's Japan, right?

20 So Japan's Rokkasho plant broke ground in 1993, and
21 then, it's just a story of postponements, never really
22 fully entered commercial operation.

23 There's been over 25, I think, it's quite a few.

24 So, people are saying, okay, it's gonna be up
25 later this year, and it might be, but it's delivered

1 mostly sunk costs so far.

2 I was 6 in 1993.

3 And I say this to flag reprocessing's potential for
4 cost overruns and delays.

5 France, they come the closest to a reprocessing
6 success story.

7 Since 1976, its La Hague plant, reprocessed, up to,
8 you know, since 1976, it's reprocessed up to 1,700 metric
9 tons per year.

10 Recovered plutonium for mixed oxide fuel, but
11 remember, it never really came close to closing the
12 nuclear fuel cycle with fast reactors.

13 The Superphénix was shut down in 1997, so now you
14 have separated plutonium accumulating faster than the
15 French reactors can actually consume it.

16 And all of this occurs in a system that's propped
17 up by expensive, extensive state subsidy and government
18 support and a heavily indebted national utility, EDF.

19 The economic rationale isn't there.

20 Russia operates these large neutron reactors,
21 consume separated plutonium, but they reprocess only a
22 fraction of their fuel these days, and, you know, and
23 then you go to Mayak, the reprocessing sites, one of the
24 most contaminated places on Earth.

25 So, America, we've learned some lessons, too.

1 West Valley, near Buffalo, New York, the only
2 commercial plant ever to operate here.

3 Processed more than 640 metric tons between 1966
4 and 1972, so that is sort of a success story.

5 But, it left behind 600,000 gallons of liquid high-
6 level waste, plus a strontium-90 plume in the nearby
7 groundwater a half a century later.

8 Another sort of success story is the Idaho Chemical
9 Processing Plant but it taught similar lessons, too.

10 So, from the 50s through 1992, the chem plant...
11 you know, recovers uranium from spent fuel, and
12 reprocessing occurs, and cleanup generates thousands of
13 cubic meters of calcined radioactive waste.

14 It generates roughly 900,000 gallons of sodium-
15 bearing liquid waste.

16 And a federal treatment plant today is still
17 working through a lot of that legacy.

18 And America also learned some lessons from
19 reprocessing plants that we never opened at all.

20 So, General Electric in Morris, Illinois, they
21 built one, and then encountered all these performance
22 promises, problems in the 1970s, and never really went
23 online.

24 And then you have Allied General's Barnwell Plant,
25 which is in South Carolina.

1 That stood, nearly complete by the middle of that
2 decade, but the whole sort of policy landscape around it
3 changes.

4 And we see, sort of, start-stop governance, and
5 political whiplash and all sorts of, changing of
6 perspectives over time.

7 And we break with reprocessing, come back to it,
8 break with it.

9 Starts with Ford.

10 He says, you know, the civilian plutonium economy
11 could never be cleanly separated from a weapons pathway.

12 Moves to Carter, defers it entirely, indefinitely,
13 1977.

14 Reagan reverses Carter's policy deferral of
15 reprocessing in 81, but by then, industry's kind of
16 spooked.

17 The commercial rationale is just not there.

18 The fast breeder reactor future that everyone was
19 imagining to exist, everyone thought that would give
20 separated plutonium this imagined value, this value that
21 we would get in the future, turned out to be imagined,
22 and it never really arrived.

23 So, now, of course, these days, newer processing
24 methods could improve the economic calculus, right?

25 They could reduce the proliferation risks.

1 They could be rolled out in way more
2 environmentally friendly ways.

3 Though, when you see how this administration's
4 handling environmental regulations, I don't know.

5 However, no current technology fully eliminates any
6 of those risks.

7 All will require massive investment and heavy
8 public support and subsidy, and all will be subject to
9 future policy whiplash, so there's an asterisk next to
10 all of this, too.

11 So I'm not saying we shouldn't do reprocessing,
12 maybe this time around it'll work out, but we just have
13 to make sure that we're all in a comfortable position
14 where, in our work lives and, when talking with our
15 nuclear peers, we address and digest these cautionary
16 lessons learned case studies from history.

17 So, okay, so, this is a kind of, speech I've been
18 giving, and I put, the nuclear campus plan, in three
19 contexts, right?

20 So, I talked about these deregulatory pressures
21 around it, these, decades of back-and-forth policy
22 whiplash that kind of make it move and these revived
23 dreams of nuclear recycling that run alongside it.

24 So, as this crowd knows well, I think many argue,
25 for the last 15 years, what we need is a mission-

1 specific, independent nuclear waste organization.

2 That's more similar to what they do in Canada, with
3 NWMO, Posiva in Finland, and SKB in Sweden, all those
4 entities have different legal composition, but they have
5 continuity of program, they have mission-specific focus,
6 they can keep promises across political cycles without
7 the stop-start political whiplash.

8 And what they can teach us in the U.S, is that
9 federal commitments are kept not through, sort of,
10 perpetual rebranding of programs across cycles, but
11 through steady patient administrative follow-through.

12 So, let's just take a quick peek at Finland, where
13 I currently live, not so coincidentally.

14 Finland's repository program, succeeded through a
15 consent-based siting process, voluntary and stepwise.

16 It advanced steadily since the 1980s.

17 The host municipality of Eurajoki was given a
18 legally binding veto right, could walk away.

19 Credibility was sustained through long-term, face-
20 to-face engagement.

21 And Finland's implementer, Posiva, moved there,
22 built up relationships, integrated into the community,
23 interfaced with regional publics, and then... the next part
24 was fiscal.

25 They start integrating economic benefits for the

1 community, right? So...

2 Within a decade of Olkiluoto and Eurajoki being
3 cited as the host facility, 90% of the real estate tax
4 revenue and one-third of the total tax revenue is from
5 nuclear facilities for the community, so they really
6 benefit from this.

7 And through all of this, they kind of flipped the
8 script on nuclear waste in a way that could be really
9 exciting if it were to happen in the United States, too,
10 right?

11 Through all of this, they've changed it from this
12 you know, hot potato you're trying to get out of your
13 backyard, or some liability, into a source of national
14 pride, right?

15 So, consider the coverage.

16 This is a 5.5-million-person country.

17 Their repository has been featured in the New York
18 Times, The Guardian, The Economist, Le Monde, The
19 Atlantic, BBC, Al Jazeera, DER SPIEGEL, they're famous.

20 And these articles position Onkalo, the nuclear
21 waste repository, as this engineering marvel.

22 It's this global first.

23 Even though SKB in Sweden gets credit for a lot of
24 the design, ultimately.

25 They designed a lot of the KBS3 approach.

1 And it's framed sort of as this philosophical
2 provocation, right?

3 So Finland, in these different counts, is a
4 technopragmatic country.

5 It trusts expertise, it's got this bold willingness
6 to be responsible over deep time.

7 And Posiva kind of achieved this by working closely
8 with journalists, supplying access and information to the
9 program, and they kind of shaped the story the world,
10 received and found wonder in, as this is the story of a
11 pathbreaker.

12 So, the question is, how do we flip the script like
13 this here in America?

14 Well... I think it is possible.

15 But the one constant we've seen so far is this
16 quadruple bind I described at the beginning of this talk,
17 right?

18 This managed immobility that we have to overcome.

19 So... that we have to overcome.

20 So, we can't just take Finland and make America
21 Finland.

22 We don't have the same public trust in our
23 institutions, we don't have the same cultural
24 valorization of expertise and engineers, we don't have
25 Nordic consensus-driven political civic culture, norms.

1 But, we can import programmatic continuity
2 structures from Finland, a stepwise, consent-based siting
3 process, that... rests on kept promises, stable approach,
4 sustained across decades.

5 Because in our country, I don't think this is just
6 gonna come from goodwill or from any single
7 administration.

8 We have to, like, build institutions that uphold,
9 this ability to keep promises and be...

10 That will be a solution to the problem of building,
11 dismantling, rebuilding political branding campaigns
12 every few years.

13 So, we're seeing some discussion.

14 Politico's reporting that, you know, there's
15 legislative principles documents being circulated to get
16 out of the Yucca Mountain-only Nuclear Waste Policy Act
17 lockjam we're currently in.

18 That's incredibly exciting news.

19 I hope that moves forward.

20 The same blueprint, however, also has what I think
21 is a bit of a Trojan horse in it.

22 It says it's going to... you know, if the Politico
23 reports are correct, then it says it, it will make it
24 federal policy to encourage reprocessing as a solution.

25 And all of this will be folded into a new entity

1 that's still sort of at DOE, the Office of Nuclear
2 Lifecycle Innovation.

3 Maybe it's inspired by Okram.

4 I'm not really sure of the details.

5 You'll have to reach out to DOE and ask, or... wait
6 to see what happens.

7 So... what we need is a stable, competent, single-
8 purpose, independent institution, and we need some
9 grassroots action to try to ask, the government for a few
10 things.

11 I think ISFSI communities, like Humboldt County,
12 where I used to live, I used to live right near an ISFSI,
13 well, not right next to it, but... a short drive away.

14 We need to ask, give us an implementer whose
15 commitments, will actually hold, take the spent fuel out
16 of the backyards, move it to a facility that's built for
17 long-term, multigenerational responsibility.

18 And I hope that in the coming years, we'll see,
19 kind of, communities taking these isolated grievances
20 into a sort of coordinated national campaign, community
21 driven pressure on this point is a more realistic way out
22 of America's 40-year impasse than the alternatives that
23 are currently on the table, like a return to reprocessing
24 or a race to new build... build a bunch of new reactors,
25 that seems like a very roundabout way of achieving this.

1 So thank you, that's all for today from the formal
2 presentation.

3 And happy to answer any of the questions that were
4 submitted.

5 JESSICA LUTERNAUER: Thank you so much, Vincent.

6 We're gonna jump into the Q&A.

7 As I mentioned, we'll try to get to the audience
8 questions.

9 For attendees, if you do have a question, please
10 leave that in the chat.

11 So to start off, I want to talk a little bit more
12 about your experience with the collaboration-based siting
13 program, and how you think some of those lessons learned
14 can be applied to the Nuclear Lifecycle Innovation Campus
15 program in the future.

16 VINCENT IALENTI: Right.

17 Thank you for the question. I think that the wisdom
18 of consent-based siting is that by proceeding at a real
19 steady, stable, respectful pace with the community, is
20 both the right thing to do and the best chance for
21 success, right?

22 It's faster in the long run, as Finland teaches us,
23 if durable local consent is achieved early.

24 Again, we don't want to repeat what's going on with
25 data centers right now, if we rush in too much.

1 I have heard recently in presentations and looking
2 at documents, that DOE plans to sign something called
3 host agreements with states, as early as 3 weeks from
4 now.

5 I don't know if this is still the plan.

6 But this is strange, because federal tribal
7 consultation is only just beginning, as far as I
8 understand.

9 Ask DOE for the official word.

10 Host agreements are conditional until the Nuclear
11 Waste Policy Act is amended and changed.

12 And communities, to my knowledge, haven't seen much
13 detail or granularity between the 25,000 jobs.

14 Or the \$50 billion in capital investment, and
15 multiply those by 3 if there's 3 campuses.

16 So, you have this Biden-era consent-based siting
17 program that I'm familiar with.

18 A host agreement meant something very different, I
19 think, and that's what's kind of my main takeaway from
20 the process.

21 So it was something that's negotiated and took a
22 long time to put together, I believe.

23 So, I hope they don't call it a host agreement,
24 because it doesn't... it appears to be a totally different
25 thing, like a semantic... it might confuse people, like

1 myself.

2 So I hope DOE has the wisdom to abstain from doing
3 a sort of premature victory lap to celebrate a host
4 agreement being assigned in the next few weeks.

5 Because that could make us all look, in the nuclear
6 world, look really good for the short term.

7 Like, progress is being made, you know, there's
8 this hype cycle around winning, and whatever.

9 But it could backfire in the long run, right?

10 Because there's places like Tooele, probably not...
11 Tooele County in, Utah, if I'm pronouncing that right,
12 apologize to the county.

13 You know, the regional government there is super
14 enthusiastic, apparently, if I understand correctly,
15 about hosting a campus.

16 That's amazing. You have a state, a community, and
17 the federal government all saying, let's do it.

18 However, the community council also passed a
19 resolution in March that talks about public hearings, and
20 planning commission review, and consent-based siting, and
21 engaging municipalities, residents, community outreach,
22 right?

23 So, I'm thinking about optics moving forward.

24 It would be strange if I'm living in Tooele County,

25 And, you know, I... this process has not yet

1 concluded, and then I see on the news something like, oh,
2 a host agreement was signed. Oh, yeah. So, wait a minute.

3 So, I would hope that, the lesson of consent-based
4 siting is to not do the victory lap until there's more...
5 show people the money, let people know that this is
6 actually happening, and make sure the local consent
7 process plays out before you go, yeah.

8 So...

9 JESSICA LUTERNAUER: So, sort of building off that,
10 you know, we talked about asking states to volunteer is a
11 really unique approach in the nation's decades-long
12 efforts to cite a repository.

13 How do you envision states, tribal governments, and
14 local communities working together?

15 VINCENT IALENTI: Right, so... what's the wisdom of
16 the nuclear campus model, is that it does punt a lot of
17 things to the states, and the states could very well be
18 better at coming up with their own consent models, etc.

19 I think Oklahoma put together a really good
20 approach, right?

21 So, it hasn't selected a community yet, you know,
22 assuming this is... I'm reading this correctly, but as I
23 understand it, you know, if DOE selects a site, then,
24 it's gonna start a second process at the state level to...
25 sorry, if DOE selects Oklahoma, then Oklahoma will start

1 a secondary process of selecting a community to, like,
2 voluntarily pick a site, and then counties and cities and
3 tribal nations can get involved.

4 And then you'll have this kind of, participatory
5 process being set into motion.

6 Again, that's a good idea. So you have the state,
7 feds coming forward.

8 You have the state raising their hand, which is
9 historic progress.

10 Amazing.

11 And then you have the third step of the community
12 doing the formal process.

13 After that, it's like a slam dunk, but we don't
14 want to get ahead of that process.

15 So I think, Oklahoma very wisely came up with that,
16 right?

17 And what we don't want is to see federal enthusiasm
18 confusing people on the local level who are at the early
19 stages or medium stages of a consent-based siting
20 process, right?

21 And we're already starting to see some of this leak
22 into the public sphere, and this is why I decided to
23 write these op-eds through discussions I've been having
24 with people, who say, oh, I heard DOE found a site, and
25 it's like, you know, I've heard that enough times that,

1 alright, so, Tennessee, for instance, you have three
2 legislators from both parties raising questions about the
3 nuclear waste component of this plan.

4 Look at Representative Butler.

5 He says there's all these constituent concerns
6 around Cumberland Plateau.

7 Idaho's another example, right?

8 So you have this incumbent administration, you have
9 members of Idaho's congressional delegation.

10 They're strongly supportive.

11 That's amazing.

12 That's phenomenal.

13 Right? But we're also seeing opposition emerge,
14 right?

15 So, in... August, there's 3 challengers to Governor
16 Little.

17 And they come out, and they object to various
18 aspects of the MOU that was just signed, right?

19 Terry Pickens, the Democratic candidate, opposing
20 Little, she said she'd withdraw the MOU.

21 So, this kind of led me to wonder, you know, if
22 there had been less sort of media stories, less, like,
23 spectacle, you know...

24 I have it right here.

25 Five states, yeah, five states offer to accept

1 nuclear waste in exchange for help with nuclear energy,
2 Associated Press.

3 If people weren't seeing, wait, my state accepted
4 this already, at such an early MOU stage, maybe the
5 opposition pathway wouldn't have been so visible, it
6 wouldn't have been so salient, it wouldn't have been so
7 fertile to be seized upon by the people who want to
8 derail the project, or just who genuinely don't think
9 it's a great idea and are exercising their democratic
10 voice and opposing it.

11 So I think that we don't gain much by being loud
12 and proud about every single milestone around the way.

13 We gotta take it slow, check the egos at the door,
14 and then wait for the communities to decide, and then
15 after that, victory lap.

16 JESSICA LUTERNAUER: So, from your perspective, what
17 can DOE do to build trust and community support and give
18 the Nuclear Lifecycle Innovation Campuses the best
19 chances of success?

20 VINCENT IALENTI: One, we gotta put numbers behind
21 the numbers. \$50 billion and 25,000 you know, jobs are
22 just words.

23 Communities need plans, not words.

24 And until they get plans and schedules, rather than
25 words, then we are at risk, again, as I mentioned in my

1 talk, of this being more of a vibe, or a mood, or an
2 aspiration, right, of a collective... excitement and
3 exuberance, right?

4 So, communities need to know that this... I mean, the
5 only reason you'd host this in your backyard if you're a
6 community is most likely jobs and money and, you know,
7 infrastructure building.

8 So... you know, I think that money talks in many
9 places, certainly talks here in, Finland as well.

10 Actually Microsoft, very interestingly invested a
11 ton of money in nuclear here, and actually 50% of the
12 power from a nuclear power plant, Lovisa, in Finland is
13 going to go to a Microsoft data center, so that's a
14 completely different story that someone should... everyone
15 should Google that right now, it's very interesting.

16 Anyway, but communities need to know where this
17 capital is coming from, right?

18 So, what are the firms paying for it?

19 At what stage of commitment are these entities at?

20 You know, is DOE gonna do cost shares?

21 Is it gonna do loan guarantees?

22 Nothing at all?

23 You know, what are the jobs?

24 How do they break down?

25 Are they good jobs?

1 Are they contracts?

2 Are they permanent?

3 Are they there just for the construction?

4 Then they go away?

5 You know?

6 How many are local hires?

7 Like, am I... if I live in a community and I have
8 this come in, you know, if I own a restaurant, I'll get a
9 bunch more business, but... you know, am I gonna get a job?

10 People are gonna ask questions like that, I
11 believe.

12 So, is there gonna be a specialized workforce that
13 flies in from the coast? You know.

14 And the bigger question, who carries the risk if
15 all this private capital doesn't ultimately materialize,
16 right?

17 So that's the other question I'd be curious about,
18 you know.

19 And what if some of the facilities are built, but,
20 you know, others aren't?

21 If they all have different financing models, like
22 some from the Nuclear Waste Fund, others from X, Y, and
23 Z, Defense Productions, I don't know, I was looking at
24 reprocessing and... you know, private capital for this,
25 like, some might... be built and others not built.

1 So I think this... nuclear campus will definitely
2 build something, but what happens if all of them aren't
3 built?

4 And then third, I think, you know, second, you
5 know, on top of that, rather, I think that we gotta fund
6 communities to have their own expertise. They can't take
7 our word for it.

8 One key thing in consent-based siting was
9 independent technical expertise.

10 You gotta fund that so they can have their own
11 experts, not just take the word of the government for
12 them.

13 Third, I think they need real off-ramps, right?
14 Because you know, like I said, in Finland, this worked
15 because Eurajoki had a legally binding veto right.

16 The veto is what made the consent real, and that's
17 what made this project so durable.

18 And a community can't say no.

19 If they can't mean it... you know, if they...

20 How do we put this? A community can't say no if
21 they can't meet... okay.

22 If you can't say yes, if you can't meaningfully say
23 no, I think that I think I did a George Bush kind of
24 backwards, kind of getting my phrase wrong.

25 You can't meaningfully say you want a facility if

1 you can't say, walk away at any moment, right?

2 So in order to meaningfully say you want the
3 facility, you have be able to say you don't want the
4 facility.

5 Tribal consultation needs to be resourced, put into
6 motion in earnest, and we can't have something called a
7 host agreement come out after that's already drafted.

8 And so once those things are in check, I think
9 we're really on progress to start succeeding.

10 JESSICA LUTERNAUER: And can you talk a little bit
11 about why disposal is such a critical component of the
12 campus concept, and how recycling and reprocessing and
13 disposal contribute to an integrated spent fuel
14 management program?

15 VINCENT IALENTI: Sure. So disposal, is... critical
16 for a very simple reason.

17 It's the terminus of whatever path you take, right?

18 So every country that has pursued reprocessing has
19 ended up, ended up finding itself needing a mined
20 geological repository of some sort, or some sort of
21 solution, to that, or a disposal pathway.

22 So, I was tough on reprocessing today, but it does
23 indeed have some advantages.

24 It can reduce future reliance on... foreign supply
25 chains, Russia, for instance, you know, it can recover

1 uranium and plutonium, potentially, you know, other
2 materials.

3 It can change the sort of quantity and composition,
4 of materials...

5 And that could potentially make, different
6 architectures of disposal facilities possible, based on
7 different types of waste that come about.

8 That said, I, I think that reprocessing, economic
9 inefficiency, non-proliferation risks, its track record
10 of the environment is a reason to approach... proceed with
11 caution if we have to proceed.

12 Why is the Trump administration so interested in
13 it?

14 You know, there's kind of an interesting.. political
15 imagination evoked by the term recycling.

16 Reprocessing kind of offers this more flattering
17 story, to the nation, I think.

18 We're no longer a country that failed to dispose of
19 its nuclear waste for decades.

20 We are now a country that is innovative enough to
21 turn the nuclear trash into nuclear treasure.

22 It's a nice story, and I hope it works.

23 It kind of discursively takes the symbol of
24 governance failure.

25 I first learned about, you know, nuclear waste in

1 college as an example of government inefficiency case
2 study.

3 And it recasted as this promise of future
4 abundance, right?

5 And the back end of the fuel cycle is no longer
6 this gridlock or stalemate, it's this industrial
7 frontier.

8 It's exciting.

9 It's this place where fuel security and waste
10 reduction and private investment and federal cleanup all
11 kind of converge in support of America's future
12 reindustrialization.

13 So... what concerns me is that, this kind of
14 excitement for reprocessing becomes so contagious that
15 people are starting to have groups on, you know, taking...
16 opening the question of whether to, take Nuclear Waste
17 Fund money and put it towards reprocessing.

18 You know, a lot of... I spend a lot of time in
19 California.

20 I meet people from Silicon Valley all the time that
21 see these pitch decks of the circular nuclear economy and
22 don't realize that you can't fully close the nuclear fuel
23 cycle, there's waste left over at the end.

24 There's kind of, like, this excitement around it
25 that's... good, but it's outpacing... what's on the ground.

1 So, I think we all need to recenter as I, as I have
2 on the fact that we really need to just find a place to
3 put this deep underground.

4 Look at Finland, look at Canada, look at Sweden.

5 We're seeing progress in some places.

6 It is possible.

7 We can do this in America.

8 We put someone on the moon.

9 We got this.

10 So, I think, deep geologic disposal is, something
11 that we shouldn't give up on.

12 JESSICA LUTERNAUER: All right, well, we are at 9
13 o'clock exactly, so thank you very much, Vincent, for
14 joining us today.

15 Thank you to all of our attendees.

16 I apologize for not getting to the audience
17 questions, but, we very much appreciate your
18 participation.

19 And again, as always, would encourage everyone to
20 visit our website, spentfuelsolutionsnow.com, to join the
21 coalition and sign up for updates about other webinars in
22 the future and news in the spent fuel space.

23 So, thank you very much for joining us.

24 VINCENT IALENTI: Thank you all for having me.