

EPEI ELECTRIC POWER RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future – What Have They Been Told and Who are They Listening to?

John Kessler Manager, Used Fuel and HLW Management Program WM'11 Session 13 28 Feb 2011

Overview: Answering the Questions (and then some)

- What have they been told? LOTS
- Who are they listening to? NO IDEA
- What I feel they have been told
- What I hope they are listening to
- What can they really accomplish?

Main Messages to the BRC (as I understand them)

- The process of selecting and developing disposal and centralized storage sites is broken
 - DOE management
 - Funding problems
 - Need for more public consensus building (perhaps the hardest to solve)
 - Recommendation: set up a FedCorp and a new public involvement process, many more...
- Push-pull on managing the waste problem
 - Push: NIMBY (except NM?)
 - Pull: Get my waste out of my state
 - Recommendation: many, but BRC must address how to make storage and disposal "workable"

Options the BRC Has Been Presented With: Move Everything to a Federal Site

- Centralized storage at a federal site
 - Eases the public process?
 - Just move waste from shutdown plants?
 - Why? The most politically palatable: full cleanup of commercial sites
- Transportation of all waste to a site will require considerable effort
 - Lack of transportation capacity
 - No NRC transportation licenses for "high burnup" used nuclear fuel
 - Most utilities now generating "high burnup" used fuel

Options the BRC Has Been Presented With: Wait for Disposal Until...???

- Kick the can down the road until technology can deal with the waste problem?
 - Continued on-site storage for decades (to centuries?)
 - Wait until technology to reduce the amount of waste is available
 - Is it *really* about the amount of waste? Probably not
 - Technology alone will never completely solve the problem of *siting* disposal and/or centralized storage
- Recommendation: work to "close" the fuel cycle needs to accelerate (EPRI recommendation: fast reactors first, then reprocessing)

Geologic Disposal Considerations for BRC

- Many geologies can be suitable
 - -WIPP is only one of many types
 - Geochemistry does NOT have to be reducing
 - BRC should avoid setting disposal geology criteria
- Disposal regulations
 - Is EPA/NRC combination working?
 - We will revert to outdated regulations if not Yucca Mountain
 - Need to update general regulation
 - Leave regulation to the regulator not NAS



Any Useful BRC Recommendation will Require Supporting Legislation

- FedCorp
- Reverse the 2002 Yucca Mountain decision and amend the NWPA
- Funding
 - To whom?
 - For what (use of Nuclear Waste Fund)?
 - Take NWF off budget?
- Siting public process: how much can/should be legislated vs. developer doing the public outreach?



Conclusions: Not Much Ground that is Unplowed

- Are we expecting too much from the BRC?
- We don't have to wait for BRC for everything. Examples:
 - Geologic exploration
 - Recycling (including fast reactor development)
 - Unless BRC clearly states used fuel is a "waste"
 - Disposal and recycling regulatory development
 - DOE-NE roadmaps are a good approach for setting out technical work
- What legislation can actually be enacted?
- If BRC only does one thing: set out an *implementable* public process for siting



Together...Shaping the Future of Electricity

