

## Critique of the SSense of Congress on advanced repro 6-16-09

Main document changes and comments		
<b>Page 1: Comment [DAK1]</b>	<b>Dave</b>	<b>6/16/2009 10:37:00 AM</b>
Define "clean." Is a 6million gallon tritium leak at the Braidwood NPP "clean" in Congress' esteemed estimation? Is a June 2009 tritium leak at the Dresden NPP 150 times higher than the EPA water standard henceforth to be considered "clean"? I could go on -- but you should be getting the idea by now. --DK--		
<b>Page 1: Comment [DAK2]</b>	<b>Dave</b>	<b>6/16/2009 10:42:00 AM</b>
The expansion of nuclear power will NOT and CANNOT contribute to the "reduction of greenhouse gas emissions" in a timely or cost-effectively enough manner. If Congress persists in making this absurd claim, it needs to include such measures as 1.) holding one's breath; 2.) halting the feeding of grains to cattle; etc. Further, and for a variety of economic and political reasons and realities, the expansion of nuclear power will kill the expansion of sustainable renewable energy -- the REAL reducers of greenhouse gas emissions. You people know better than this. Why are you so disingenuous? --DK--		
<b>Page 1: Comment [DAK3]</b>	<b>Dave</b>	<b>6/16/2009 12:57:00 PM</b>
Nuclear power is not ESSENTIAL for the production of electricity, providing at best 19% of our electricity. When EPRI and the National Labs and others REPEATEDLY reach the same conclusion -- the aggressive energy efficiency and conservation could displace between 24-44% of all the electricity generated (i.e. 1.26 to 2.32 TIMES the ENTIRE output of the entire nuclear industry operating at its best), and do it at a far lower cost, then nuclear can hardly be viewed as "essential." If anything is is superfluous. -DK--		
<b>Page 1: Comment [DAK4]</b>	<b>Dave</b>	<b>6/16/2009 10:48:00 AM</b>
See Comment 2 above.		
<b>Page 1: Comment [DAK5]</b>	<b>Dave</b>	<b>6/16/2009 12:58:00 PM</b>
No. SNF (spent-nuclear fuel) should be DISPOSED OF in a limited number of secure centralized facilities. SNF can and is being "stored" at reactor sites -- and if you believe the statements of the nuclear industry and the NRC, it can remain there "safely" for at least 100 years. You can't have it both ways: it is either a finding that 1.) it is NOT being stored safely now, and therefore must be moved; or 2.) it is safe there for 100 years. These are MUTUALLY EXCLUSIVE assertions by the industry and the regulators. Finally, adding more "storage" facilities will NOT get rid of the need, use and requirement of having operating spent fuel pools and dry-cask storage; it will only add MORE storage facilities, not reduce any; thus adding even a "limited number of secure centralized facilities" INCREASES the number not decreases it.		
<b>Page 1: Comment [DAK6]</b>	<b>Dave</b>	<b>6/16/2009 1:00:00 PM</b>
If this is enacted, it will MOST CERTAINLY result in making Illinois a regional storage site; and most probably, given the poor history of both Congress and DOE in dealing with the SNF problem -- it will leave Illinois as THE DE FACTO SNF storage/disposal facility INDEFINITELY. Any politician endorsing this concept of centralized storage facilities (CSFs) will have to face and defend this criticism back home and in public, since Illinois will be taking in from other states even MORE SNF/HLRW than it already has -- which is currently the highest amount in the US. Whoever supports CSF will be responsible for making Illinois the "new Nevada/Yucca Mt." for the foreseeable future. --DK--		
<b>Page 1: Comment [DAK7]</b>	<b>Dave</b>	<b>6/16/2009 11:00:00 AM</b>
...and MAY NOT. Given the things that Congress allegedly has found (God knows where they looked), this "may" will most definitely become a MAY NOT. --DK--		
<b>Page 2: Comment [DAK8]</b>	<b>Dave</b>	<b>6/16/2009 1:01:00 PM</b>
This is an indefensible assertion unless you include: 1.) the time frame you are talking about; and 2.) the specific types of nuclides you are referring to (i.e. shoter-lived fission products; transuranics; etc.). Besides-- unless it falls on you, the volume is not the primary important safety characteristic; the radioactivity IS.		
<b>Page 2: Comment [DAK9]</b>	<b>Dave</b>	<b>6/16/2009 1:01:00 PM</b>
Advanced reactors with closed fuel cycles have been proposed before; and not only did they not work, they are also de facto self-contained BOMB PRODUCTION FACILITIES if sold into the wrong hands. Historically is was demonstrated that the only way to make these kinds of facilities economically viable		

was to sell ALL aspects of the closed cycle as a single package on the same site -- guaranteeing their sale as complete potential bomb factories. This was patiently explained in person to a previously clueless Sen. Carol Mosely Braun, and a should-have-known-better Sen. Paul Simon. But because they were so enamored with the prospect of new jobs at Argonne National Lab, they were willing to unleash this enormous nuclear weapons proliferation potential on the world.

**Page 2: Comment [DAK10] Dave 6/16/2009 11:13:00 AM**

As above. This is total fiction and wishful thinking, the latter not being sound energy, climate disruption nor nuclear proliferation policy. --DK--

**Page 2: Comment [DAK11] Dave 6/16/2009 1:02:00 PM**

As above. You put everything on one site, forget nuclear non-proliferation. --DK--

**Page 2: Comment [DAK12] Dave 6/16/2009 1:02:00 PM**

Proliferation-resistant is not the same as proliferation-proof. Physicist Frank vonHippel states that going to this so-called advanced reprocessing technology reduces the proliferation resistance of spent-nuclear fuel (SNF) by nearly a factor of 100 compared to un-reprocessed SNF.

**Page 3: Comment [DAK13] Dave 6/16/2009 1:03:00 PM**

This is not accurate; see above for part of the explanation. But note that the "transmutation" of some of the larger transuranic elements into smaller fission-products does NOT always decrease the lifespan for disposal care. Some of the new fission products created have LONGER life-spans and hence will remain as a threat longer than this statement asserts, while also in some cases being MORE of an immediate radioactive threat. --DK--

**Page 3: Comment [DAK14] Dave 6/16/2009 1:03:00 PM**

Compared to what exactly? And why should this new minimal level be acceptable? Perhaps the minimal level attainable will even exceed current standards for exposure. Should the public then tolerate this new radiologic assault above even current inadequate standards which should be revised downwards according to experts today?

**Page 3: Comment [DAK15] Dave 6/16/2009 11:25:00 AM**

This in NO WAY guarantees the health and safety of the public and the environment. The NRC has no credibility with the public. They are industry lap-dogs incapable of supporting what the public wants if it conflicts with the nuclear industry dictates. They are rubber stamps of all things nuclear. Recall -- everything done by the Third Reich was completely legal under their system of regulation too. Doesn't mean the public there was protected in any way. --DK--

**Header and footer changes**

**Text Box changes**

**Header and footer text box changes**

**Footnote changes**

**Endnote changes**