

HearingDocket - MOX Limited Appearance Hearing Statement

From: "Dolph Honicker" <djhonicker@msn.com>
To: <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>
Date: 09/11/2007 7:05 PM
Subject: MOX Limited Appearance Hearing Statement
CC: <pah@nrc.gov>, <mxc7@nrc.gov>

DOCKETED
USNRC

September 12, 2007 (7:38am)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Docket No. 70-3098-MLA

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
MOX Limited Appearances.

Gentlemen:

At the limited appearance for production of Mixed Oxide (MOX) nuclear reactor fuel from bomb grade plutonium pits at the Savannah River Site, held in North Augusta, on Aug. 21, 2007 you indicated you would continue to accept limited appearance statements until an order was issued. Please add these comments to those I made verbally and in writing at that event.

Since the Aug. 21-22 Hearings concerning the issuance of a license for Shaw Areva MOX Services (SHAMS) to receive bomb grade plutonium pits, I did not address issue and wish to do so now. I also would like to address the cost-benefit analysis.

What will happen to the plutonium pits if you issue the license under consideration for SHAMS to receive this bomb grade, bomb ready, plutonium, and Congress defunds the construction or operation of the facility? Will SHAMS have legal title to it, and as such, be free to transport it to other locations, including out of the United States? Will they have the option of selling it, either as bomb grade plutonium, or as reactor fuel, to any entity of their choosing?

From a purely economic standpoint, the material is worth more as bomb grade plutonium than as reactor fuel. Once you issue the license under consideration, what proof do you have that SHAMS will not choose to maximize their profits? How do you know it could not be diverted by a terrorist or a greedy employee?

Since the whole project is nothing more than a hole in the ground, what will happen to the plutonium between the time the license is issued and production begins? Instead of issuing said license now, wouldn't it be prudent to retain title to the plutonium until the facility is open?

What is the cost benefit analysis of cost of construction and operation of the facility vs. the profit from the sale of the plutonium reactor fuel? Does the projected cost of \$4.8 billion include construction of all three segments of the facility, PDCF, MOX and WSB, or only MOX? Has the price escalated again since that guestimation was made? If that price is only for MOX, how much additional will PDCF and WSB add to it? When is construction scheduled to be completed? If there are construction delays, how much will the cost increase?

What will be the annual cost of production? Do you have a closed end contract with SHAMS, or is their

Template=SECY-038

SECY-02

contract a cost plus one, which is open ended and can cost the American taxpayers any amount that SHAMS determines? Will they be able to renegotiate the contract during the lifetime of the operation? Does it have escalation clauses?

What addition costs will be incurred for the over 5 million miles of transportation that is included in the EIS as necessary for the completion of this project? What other costs, other than transportation and the SHAMS contract, will be accrued?

How much will it cost to decommission the facility after it's expected 20-year lifetime. Who pays that fee?

What are your decommissioning plans? Again, since you only have jurisdiction over MOX and not PDCF and WSB, are these figures all inclusive, or only for MOX?

I was told at the hearing that Duke Power Co. will pay \$2 billion for the plutonium reactor fuel over the lifetime of it's production. Is this figure accurate? Who sells the fuel, DOE, or SHAMS?

So, the bottom line is:

(1) Who pays the total costs, and how much are they projected to be, over the lifetime of the facility including decommissioning?

(2) How much revenue is this project projected to produce?

If #2 exceeds #1, the project is not cost beneficial and, as such, should be cancelled, and the license denied.

Respectfully submitted,

Jeannine Honicker
704 Camellia Drive
LaGrange, Ga. 30240
djhonicker@msn.com

Mail Envelope Properties (46E71F16.298 : 18 : 25240)

Subject: MOX Limited Appearance Hearing Statement
Creation Date Tue, Sep 11, 2007 7:04 PM
From: "Dolph Honicker" <djhonicker@msn.com>
Created By: djhonicker@msn.com

Recipients

nrc.gov
OWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
HearingDocket (HearingDocket)

nrc.gov
OWGWPO04.HQGWDO01
PAH CC (Patricia Harich)

nrc.gov
OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01
MXC7 CC (Marcia Carpentier)

Post Office

OWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
OWGWPO04.HQGWDO01
OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov
nrc.gov
nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
TEXT.htm	6177	
Mime.822	7606	

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
ReplyRequested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered

Junk Mail handling disabled by User
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator
Junk List is not enabled
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled
Block List is not enabled