

EDO Principal Correspondence Control

FROM: DUE: 06/27/12 EDO CONTROL: G20120378
DOC DT: 05/23/12
FINAL REPLY:

Richard Yarnell
Beavercreek, Oregon

TO:

Chairman Jaczko

FOR SIGNATURE OF : ** GRN ** CRC NO: 12-0241

Holahan, NRO

DESC:

ROUTING:

Pebble Bed Reactors (EDATS: SECY-2012-0284)

Borchardt
Weber
Johnson
Ash
Mamish
OGC/GC
Harrison, OEDO

DATE: 06/04/12

ASSIGNED TO: CONTACT:
NRO Holahan

SPECIAL INSTRUCTIONS OR REMARKS:

EDATS

Electronic Document and Action Tracking System

EDATS Number: SECY-2012-0284

Source: SECY

General Information

Assigned To: NRO

OEDO Due Date: 6/27/2012 11:00 PM

Other Assignees:

SECY Due Date: NONE

Subject: Pebble Bed Reactors

Description:

CC Routing: NONE

ADAMS Accession Numbers - Incoming: NONE

Response/Package: NONE

Other Information

Cross Reference Number: G20120378, LTR-12-0241

Staff Initiated: NO

Related Task:

Recurring Item: NO

File Routing: EDATS

Agency Lesson Learned: NO

OEDO Monthly Report Item: NO

Process Information

Action Type: E-mail

Priority: Medium

Signature Level: No Signature Required

Sensitivity: None

Approval Level: No Approval Required

Urgency: NO

OEDO Concurrence: NO

OCM Concurrence: NO

OCA Concurrence: NO

Special Instructions:

Document Information

Originator Name: Richard Yarnell

Date of Incoming: 5/23/2012

Originating Organization: Citizens

Document Received by SECY Date: 6/1/2012

Addressee: Chairman Jaczko

Date Response Requested by Originator: NONE

Incoming Task Received: E-mail

Joosten, Sandy

From: Richard Yarnell [richard.yarnell@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 23, 2012 7:10 PM
To: CHAIRMAN Resource
Subject: Why not Pebble Bed Reactors?

Sir,

I resisted deployment of new reactors until the issue of waste disposal was settled. I've come to realize that the standards for safe, permanent disposal is unrealistic and fraught with ego: 10,000 years is beyond any realistic calculation. Now I'm content with the First Nation standard of 175 years that rolls over with each succeeding generation. We should be able to provide secure storage for that period of time. Succeeding generations will have better, probably unimagined, technology to work with long before 175 years expires. That's a reasonable regime and doesn't offer to stymie needed deployment of nuclear generating plants.

I do object to the current crop of water cooled reactors that are expensive to design and approve, expensive to build, and, as we're finding, susceptible to catastrophic failure.

When I was a kid and paying serious attention to nuclear potential for solving many energy problems (I lived near San Onofre), the US was said to be doing serious research on pebble bed reactors, reactors which don't require special siting, a source of cooling water, and which are inherently safer because they cannot overheat if properly designed.

Will you explain to me why we gave up on that research and why, in the face of 3 Mile Island, Chernobyl, and Fukushima, there has been not a mention of using alternative nuclear technology? I've read that China is about to deploy 5 experimental pebble bed reactors. I'd rather see us do it, set the standards, and reclaim the leadership we had when I was a kid.

As we develop variable energy sources (PV, wind, tidal or wave generation), we're going to need clean, safe, backup power sources. Pebble bed reactors that can be deployed near potential load centers, seem to me the perfect match.

I look forward to your response.

I'm sorry to see you leaving the agency.

Regards,

Richard Yarnell
Beavercreek, OR

--

"I hope we shall crush in its birth the aristocracy of our monied corporations which dare already to challenge our government to a trial by strength and bid defiance to the laws of our country."

-- Thomas Jefferson

Make a small loan, Make a big difference - <http://www.Kiva.org>