OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL TICKET

Date Printed: Mar 22, 2013 15:35

PAPER NUMBER: LTR-13-0249 **LOGGING DATE:** 03/22/2013

ACTION OFFICE: EDO

To: Collins, RIV
cys: OEDO
NRR
Merzke, OEDO
Cassidy, OEDO

AUTHOR: Don Leichtling

AFFILIATION:

ADDRESSEE: NRCExecSec Resource

SUBJECT: Concerns cost of a Nuclear Problem and a CPUC Suggestion

ACTION: Appropriate

DISTRIBUTION: RF, SECY to Ack.

LETTER DATE: 03/21/2013

ACKNOWLEDGED Yes

SPECIAL HANDLING: Lead office to publicly release 24 hours after SECY's assignment, via SECY/EDO/DPC.

NOTES:

FILE LOCATION: ADAMS

DATE DUE: **DATE SIGNED:**

Remsburg, Kristy

From: Capt.D [captddd@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 21, 2013 12:49 PM
To: Capt D
Subject: Cost of a Nuclear "Problem" + A CPUC Suggestion!

If I could have attended the CPUC meeting today in San Diego, this is what I would say:

French Nuclear Disaster Scenario Was So Bad The Government Kept It Secret
http://www.businessinsider.com/potential-cost-of-a-nuclear-accident-so-high-its-a-secret-2013-3 via @bi_contributors
snip
Catastrophic nuclear accidents, like Chernobyl in 1986 or Fukushima No. 1 in 2011, are, we're incessantly told, very rare, and their probability of occurring infinitesimal.

But when they do occur, they get costly. So costly that the French government, when it came up with cost estimates for an accident in France, kept them secret.

But now the report was leaked to the French magazine, Le Journal de Dimanche. Turns out, the upper end of the cost spectrum of an accident at the nuclear power plant at Dampierre, in the Department of Loiret in north-central France, amounted to over three times the country's GDP.

Hence, the need to keep it secret. The study was done in 2007 by the Institute for Radiological Protection and Nuclear Safety (IRSN), a government agency under joint authority of the Ministry of Defense and the Ministry of Environment, Industry, Research, and Health.With over 1,700 employees, it's France's "public service expert in nuclear and radiation risks." This isn't some overambitious, publicity-hungry think tank.

It evaluated a range of disaster scenarios that might occur at the Dampierre plant. In the best-case scenario, costs came to €760 billion—more than a third of France's GDP. At the other end of the spectrum: €5.8 trillion! Over three times France's GDP. A devastating amount. So large that France could not possibly deal with it. Yet, France gets 75% of its electricity from nuclear power. The entire nuclear sector is controlled by the state, which also owns 85% of EDF, the mega-utility that operates France's 58 active nuclear reactors spread over 20 plants. So, three weeks ago, the Institute released a more politically correct report for public consumption. It pegged the cost of an accident at €430 billion.

"There was no political smoothening, no pressure," claimed IRSN Director General Jacques Repussard, but he admitted, "it's difficult to publish these kinds of numbers." He said the original report with a price tag of €5.8 trillion was designed to counter the reports that EDF had fabricated, which "very seriously underestimated the costs of the incidents."

Both reports were authored by IRSN economist Patrick Momal, who struggled to explain away the differences. The new number, €430 billion, was based on a "median case" of radioactive releases, as was the case in

Fukushima, he told the JDD, while the calculations of 2007 were based more on what happened at Chernobyl. But then he added that even the low end of the original report, the €760 billion, when updated with the impact on tourism and exports, would jump to €1 trillion.

I posted the above at this NRC web Blog: http://public-blog.nrc-gateway.gov/2013/03/20/taking-an-updated-look-at-a-potential-accidents-economic-consequences/comment-page-1/#comment-81265

and

If I had a bit more time, I would suggest that the CPUC delay voting on Peaker Plants in SD and instead increase the financial limitations on who can qualify for energy upgrades by 50% and then use SoCal as a test to see how much new Solar can be installed in the next 18 months using money that is just sitting in a CPUC holding account! Then if the number of new solar installations are really big then the need for the Peaker Plants will be ZERO... This is a perfect opportunity for the CPUC to challenge ratepayers and help make California become far more energy efficient.