

Batkin, Joshua

From: McDonough, Alexander (Reid) [Alexander_McDonough@reid.senate.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, December 02, 2009 1:31 PM
To: McDonough, Alexander (Reid)
Subject: FW: REID, ENSIGN ANNOUNCE RELEASE OF GAO REPORT ON YUCCA MOUNTAIN

fyi

From: REID-NVMEDIA [mailto:REID-NVMEDIA@DEMOCRATIC-MESSAGE-CENTER.SENATE.GOV] **On Behalf Of** Brede, Tom (Reid)
Sent: Wednesday, December 02, 2009 12:40 PM
To: REID-NVMEDIA@DEMOCRATIC-MESSAGE-CENTER.SENATE.GOV
Subject: REID, ENSIGN ANNOUNCE RELEASE OF GAO REPORT ON YUCCA MOUNTAIN



For Immediate Release

Wednesday, December 2, 2009

CONTACT: Reid -- Jon Summers / Tom Brede, (202) 224-9521
Ensign -- Rebecca Fisher, (202) 224-6244

REID, ENSIGN ANNOUNCE RELEASE OF GAO REPORT ON YUCCA MOUNTAIN

Washington, D.C. – Nevada Senators Harry Reid and John Ensign today announced the release of a report from the Government Accountability Office (GAO) analyzing the costs and challenges of the Yucca Mountain Project and alternatives. The report, which was requested by Reid, Ensign and Sen. Barbara Boxer of California, shows that on-site and interim storage are less costly than Yucca Mountain. The GAO's report also states that the additional time spent in on-site storage would make the waste safer to handle, reducing risks should the waste need to be transported in the future.

"This report confirms what most Nevadans already know, that the President made the right decision to stop the Yucca Mountain Project and focus on finding alternatives to dealing with nuclear waste," Reid said. "In addition to saving taxpayers a lot of money, using dry cask storage offers a safe way to store the waste while the blue ribbon commission does its work to find a responsible, long-term solution."

"As I have previously stated, on-site storage is currently the safest and most cost-efficient way to manage our nation's nuclear waste," said Ensign. "Yucca Mountain is dead because it has always been a failed policy, and this report illustrates just that."

The GAO report can be found on Senator Reid’s website at <http://reid.senate.gov/newsroom/upload/20091202-gao-report-nuclear-waste-mgmt.pdf>

The report analyzed the costs, benefits, and challenges of the following scenarios:

Yucca Mountain		on-site storage		centralized interim storage at 2 sites	
70,000 MT	\$27-\$39 billion	70,000 MT (100 years)	\$10-\$26 billion	70,000 MT (100 years)	\$12-\$20 billion
153,000 MT	\$41-\$67 billion	153,000 MT (100 years)	\$13-\$34 billion	153,000 MT (100 years)	\$15-\$29 billion
* In 2008, DOE estimated that Yucca would cost \$96 billion, but they used constant 2007 dollars instead of discounting the value of the dollar as GAO did.		153,000 MT and repository after 100 years	\$20-\$97 billion	153,000 MT and repository after 100 years	\$23-\$81 billion
		153,000 MT (500 years)	\$34-\$225 billion		

###