

From: Tom Clements <tomclements329@cs.com>
To: <coombsn@scsenate.org>
Date: 11/17/2008 4:24 PM
Subject: att: State Regulation of Public Utilities Review Committee
Attachments: Alvarez 2HLW_and_the_Nuclear_Renaissance_November_7,_2008_Rev._2.pdf;
SCIAM Reproc May 08.pdf

Dear State Regulation of Public Utilities Review Committee,

On behalf of Friends of the Earth, I have already submitted comments and documentation via mail but would like to add the attached pdf documents to what I have all already submitted:

1. High-Level Radioactive Waste and the Nuclear Energy Renaissance, Bob Alvarez, November 7, 2008

The document reaches the following conclusions:

- The United States should re-establish its policy of discouraging reprocessing to stem proliferation risks.
- Spent fuel can be safely stored in dry-hardened storage modes for 100 years at less expense than the “closed” fuel cycle.
- The practice of densely compacted spent fuel pools in the U.S. should be phased out.
- The parameters defining growth of nuclear energy should include credible disposal of high-level radioactive wastes.

2. Rethinking Nuclear Fuel Recycling, Dr. Frank von Hippel, Scientific America magazine, May 2008

In this article, Dr. von Hippel, an expert in reprocessing, outlines the problems with the reprocessing proposal now being considered as part of the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership.

The title of the article was changed in Scientific American to Nuclear Fuel Recycling: More Trouble Than It's Worth and can be found on line at <http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?id=rethinking-nuclear-fuel-recycling>.

Conclusions include:

Spent nuclear fuel contains plutonium, which can be extracted and used in new fuel.

To reduce the amount of long-lived radioactive waste, the U.S. Department of Energy has proposed reprocessing spent fuel in this way and then “burning” the plutonium in special reactors.

But reprocessing is very expensive. Also, spent fuel emits lethal radiation, whereas separated plutonium can be handled easily. So reprocessing invites the possibility that terrorists might steal plutonium and construct an atom bomb.

The author argues against reprocessing and for storing the waste in casks until an underground repository is ready.

Thank you very much for accepting these documents into the record.

Sincerely,

Tom Clements
Southeastern Nuclear Campaign Coordinator
Friends of the Earth
1112 Florence St.
Columbia, SC 29201
803-834-3084
tomclements329@cs.com