

Works was discharged and the Senate proceeded to consider the nominations en bloc.

NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER HANSON

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, it is my pleasure to support the confirmation of Christopher Hanson to be a Commissioner at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Chris has diligently served the Senate and the people of California over the last 6 years as a key member of the Senate Energy and Water Development Appropriations Subcommittee staff. During that time, he has advised me and the full Senate Appropriations Committee on issues surrounding the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, including its budget, its oversight of nuclear reactor decommissioning at San Onofre in California, and issues related to proposed new reactor technologies.

He has also overseen nuclear energy research and development, radioactive waste cleanup, nuclear weapons, non-proliferation, and naval reactor programs.

Prior to coming to the Senate, Chris worked at the Department of Energy, where he advised the Assistant Secretary of Nuclear Energy and worked on appropriations issues for then-Secretary Steven Chu.

In all, Chris has 25 years of experience working on the very issues at the heart of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's mandate.

As the Senate knows, the members and staff of the Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee work seamlessly together in order to produce a bipartisan bill each year. Chris's expertise, his professionalism, and his quiet, good nature are instrumental in that effort. He is respected and appreciated by Members on both sides of the aisle.

It is not surprising, therefore, that Senator ALEXANDER, our subcommittee chairman, sent a letter to the Environmental and Public Works Committee in support of Chris' nomination, which I very much appreciate. Senator ALEXANDER and I have spoken about how much the subcommittee will miss Chris, but we are happy for him, and we look forward to working with Chris in his new role.

I have every confidence that Chris will give his usual thoughtfulness and insight to the issues that come before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And I know the other Commissioners will find him to be a joy to work with.

I thank Chris for his dedicated service to the people of California, to the Senate Appropriations Committee, and to the U.S. Senate, and I look forward to his success in his new role and continuing to serve the country with all the expertise and professionalism he has shown us these past 6 years.

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the nomination of David Wright to be a member of the Nuclear

Regulatory Commission for 5 more years. Amidst a global pandemic that has caused the greatest public health crisis in a century and the worst economic catastrophe since the Great Depression, we are spending our time in the United States voting on a nominee for the NRC who will likely take actions that put the lives and livelihoods of Nevadans at even further risk.

David Wright has a long history of working to advance the failed and fiscally irresponsible proposal to dump our Nation's nuclear waste at the Yucca Mountain site. In his previous work as chairman of the Public Service Commission of South Carolina, he supported continuing licensing of Yucca Mountain. Additionally, in 2005 he founded the Yucca Mountain Task Force and criticized local opposition to the project, calling it "myopic resistance." That is how he characterizes the people of Nevada fighting back against the injustice of having no say in whether or not we are to become the Nation's nuclear dumping ground.

For these reasons, in August 2018, the State of Nevada filed a formal petition with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit challenging now-Commissioner Wright's refusal to disqualify himself from participating in NRC Yucca Mountain licensing decisions. According to the State of Nevada at the time, Wright's participation in any licensing decisions would violate Nevada's constitutional right to unbiased decision makers at the NRC.

Numerous studies have since shown that Yucca Mountain, only 90 miles from Las Vegas, is a physically unsuitable site that would threaten the health and safety of Nevadans and would take half a century to complete. Notably, Yucca Mountain is located above an aquifer in an area of moderate to high seismic activity and is subject to oxidizing and corrosive elements. In fact, just this week, only days before we have been asked to vote on this pro-Yucca nominee, two earthquakes—one of which was of 6.5 magnitude—struck Nevada less than 150 miles from Yucca Mountain and less than a dozen miles from one of the proposed transportation routes for shipping nuclear waste to Yucca. In addition to threatening the health and safety of Nevadans, transporting all of our Nation's nuclear waste to Yucca Mountain would threaten our national security, as the site is directly adjacent to the Nevada Test and Training Range, NTTR, the largest air and ground military training space in the contiguous United States. Establishing a nuclear waste repository in such close proximity to NTTR could therefore directly jeopardize the readiness of our Air Force.

Most importantly, Nevadans have never consented to storing other States' waste at Yucca Mountain. With thousands of Nevadans dying of COVID-19 and jobless claims in the State at unprecedented levels, today,

among the numerous actions this Senate could have chosen to take, we are voting on the confirmation of an individual who wants to add insult to injury by proceeding with an ill-advised plan for nuclear waste storage that ignores the voices of Nevadans.

I will not stand for this. I, therefore, cast my vote against the nomination of David Wright to serve on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote on the nominations en bloc with no intervening action or debate; that if confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made laid upon the table, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Hanson and Wright nominations en bloc?

The nominations were confirmed.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 691 and 692, with the exception of Prestidge and Rivera; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate, and the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations considered and confirmed are as follows:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Coast Guard to the grade indicated under title 14 U.S.C., section 2121(d):

To be rear admiral

Rear Adm. (lh) Thomas G. Allan
Rear Adm. (lh) Laura M. Dickey
Rear Adm. (lh) Douglas M. Fears
Rear Adm. (lh) John W. Mauger
Rear Adm. (lh) Nathan A. Moore
Rear Adm. (lh) Brian K. Penoyer
Rear Adm. (lh) Matthew W. Sibley

The following named officers for appointment in the United States Coast Guard to the grade indicated under title 14 U.S.C., section 2121(e):

To be rear admiral (lower half)

Capt. Christopher A. Bartz
Capt. Scott W. Clendenin
Capt. Mark J. Fedor
Capt. Shannon N. Gilreath
Capt. Jonathan P. Hickey

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Executive Session for the consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 658 through 688 and all nominations on the Secretary's Desk in the Air Force, Army, Marine Corps, and Navy; that the nominations be confirmed, the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the