

*RAS 14194***Hearing Docket - MOX hearing, additional limited appearance statement**

From: "Dolph Honicker" <djhonicker@msn.com>
To: <hearingdocket@nrc.gov>
Date: 09/30/2007 12:04 AM
Subject: MOX hearing, additional limited appearance statement
CC: <pah@nrc.gov>, <mxc7@nrc.gov>, <dstinson@moxproject.com>

DOCKETED
USNRC

October 1, 2007 (7:45am)

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Docket No. 70-3098-MLA

Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
 In the Matter of the Proposed MOX Fuel Facility Licensing

Gentlemen:

Today I sent the following letter today to Mr. Dave Stinson, President of Shaw, Areva MOX Services, and would like it to be entered as an additional limited appearance statement.

"Mr. Dave Stinson, President,
 Shaw Areva MOX Services
 P.O. Box 7097
 Aiken. S. C. 29804

Dear Mr. Stinson,

When I asked how much Duke Power was going to pay for the MOX fuel for Catawba and McGuire, at the Limited Appearance hearing in North Augusta on August 21, 2007, the answer I received was \$2 billion.

I recently read the request for utilities to apply to use an additional amount of MOX fuel, and that left me with four questions:

- (1) Will the additional MOX fuel be produced from the plutonium that was recently disclosed to be coming to SRS from Hanford and two national labs?
- (2) I noticed in the request that the fuel would be supplied over a 15 year period. The MOX EIS discussed 10 and 20 years of operation. Can you clarify which is the correct number?
- (3) There was no price given in the request. In fact, it looked to me like this was a request for utilities to submit a bid that would cover reimbursement for costs associated with their using it. Is that correct?
- (4) Is the contract with Duke for use of MOX fuel at Catawba and McGuire finalized, and is it publicly available?

Thank you very much,

Jeannine Honicker"

I sent this via email to dstinson@moxproject.com

Would you be so kind as to answer these questions as well?

They go to the heart of the matter of cost benefit analysis. If MOX fuel production costs more than the expected revenue received form the sale of MOX fuel, this project is not cost beneficial, and the alternative of continued storage

Template=SECY-038

SECY-02

file:///C:/temp/GW}00001.HTM

10/01/2007

of category 1 bomb grade plutonium should be selected as the preferred alternative. The MOX license should be denied. Has a recent cost benefit analysis been performed, including the life cycle cost of operation as well as construction?

Another question that I would like addressed is, "If this plutonium, category 1, bomb grade, can be made into MOX fuel that can be burned in conventional reactors, as Catawba and McGuire are, why is it necessary to build advanced burner reactors, modified breeders, to burn MOX fuel made from spent nuclear fuel, as proposed in GHEP? Or, if the reverse is true, why is it acceptable to burn category 1, bomb grade plutonium MOX fuel in conventional reactors?"

I noticed in the above referenced call for additional reactors to burn MOX fuel that there was no disclosure that a reactor accident would cause 14% increased damage because of the MOX fuel vs. the same accident at a plant that burned only low enriched uranium fuel. (Disclosed in MOX FEIS NUREG 1767) Full disclosure mandates that that should have been spelled out in the contract. Most utility owners will not have read the FEIS, therefore, the contract should be recalled and that information included.

I use the term "burn" because it is currently used to denote the irradiation of nuclear fuel to produce electricity. It is a totally inappropriate word, but it is convenient.

Since your obligation is to assure the protection of the public, and to only issue licenses that have been proven to be cost beneficial, I hereby request that you deny the license that is currently before this board.

Sincerely,

Jeannine Honicker
P. O. Box 637
LaGrange, Georgia, 30241
djhonicker@msn.com

Mail Envelope Properties (46FF2023.B9D : 22 : 23453)**Subject:** MOX hearing, additional limited appearance statement**Creation Date** Sun, Sep 30, 2007 12:03 AM**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)

moxproject.com

dstinson CC

Post Office

OWGWPO02.HQGWDO01

OWGWPO04.HQGWDO01

OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov

nrc.gov

nrc.gov

moxproject.com

Files**Size****Date & Time**

TEXT.htm

6214

Mime.822

7682

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