
From: BRC [CommissionDFO@Nuclear.Energy.Gov]
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2011 10:35 AM
To: correspondence@blueribboncommission.net
Subject: FW: "What We've Heard" Report Available for Comment

From: auernheimer@gmail.com on behalf of Mark A[SMTP:MARK.A@SEALPACADVANTAGE.COM]
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2011 10:35:16 AM
To: BRC
Cc: BRC; asw321@gmail.com
Subject: Re: "What We've Heard" Report Available for Comment
Good Morning,

I have reviewed the staff report at the link sent in your correspondence and am commenting in response. Although the report lays out many substantive and important issues, I believe it misses substantially many specifics of "what is being heard", and could be better focused to achieve the goals of the BRC.

Generally, and factually, the BRC heard a lot of complaints. In a nutshell my critique is that the BRC should focus more attention on the solutions heard.

I have listed Chief specific-details not included in the staff report for some of the seven broad categories your report has defined:

- 1) Program/Governance- Issues listed valid, but I would like to see more Program Concentration on the way forward with alternative technologies such as **Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactor (LFTR)** and other burners to reduce our need for storage.
- 2) Waste Fee Fund- Frustrations heard are real, but could be mitigated with actions - make 20% of waste fees available for burner technology Productions (a small pilot systems) to eliminate waste. **Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactor (LFTR)** technology, and other burner technologies, may be well suited for this action.
- 4) Reactor Technologies- Emphasis needed on **Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactor (LFTR)** . MSR technology was running in the 1960s and 1970s. Produce pilot projects Now in order to "tune for industrialization" on a large scale.
- 5) Materials/Wast Transport- **Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactor (LFTR)** burners would mitigate, reduce, and substantially add to the remedy of these issues. On-site processing of sate piles to burn actinides at selected nuclear park storage sites would substantially reduce transport needs, costs, and risks.
- 6) Storage of Wastes- **Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactor (LFTR)** burners would mitigate, reduce, and substantially add to the remedy of these issues. **Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactor (LFTR)** burners would utilize the waste as fuel. This fuel could be the incentive that Utilities need in order to implement a free market solution.
- 7) Disposal Systems- **Liquid Fluoride Thorium Reactor (LFTR)** burners would mitigate, reduce, and substantially add to the remedy of these issues.

I strongly believe actions must be taken Now for production of solutions, not just study and analysis.

America's broader nuclear problem is not necessarily wholly included in the BRC agenda. This problem is one of public confidence. Political Inaction, combined with the fact that waste piles are growing, are keys to a poor public consciousness in nuclear issues. Inaction allows the public view to be skeptical and deters support from everyday Americans.

I ask you to recommend to Use a portion of waste fee money now to create LFTR burner pilot projects with engineering variations/specializations. Through these projects, the way forward for a total fuel cycle problem solution will be found. If facilities are being built to "Dispose of Waste", the public will be happier. When more than a couple of these sites are running the frustration and complaints will be reduced in tenor because a solution is in process.

I strongly ask and urge, in response to my feedback, is to **have additional discussions of the specific points I have made above with Kirk Sorensen**, who did have input to the BRC process. Utilize his expertise much more heavily.

Every member of the BRC and the Administration should give Mr. Sorenson a two hour one-on-one -- this would be greatly in the national interest.

Aim high, take immediate Action.

Produce now, study always.

Regards,

Mark Auernheimer
804 714 6869
Richmond, VA

On Wed, Mar 30, 2011 at 11:07 AM, BRC <CommissionDFO@nuclear.energy.gov> wrote:
Good Morning,

As you are aware, the Commission is charged with submitting a draft report to the Secretary of Energy by July 29, 2011. As a first step toward meeting that deadline, the Commission directed the staff to prepare a report summarizing the key themes the Commission has heard up to this point in the process. The "What We've Heard" report does not attempt to recount every comment or opinion submitted to the Commission thus far; rather, the aim is to summarize major themes from the extensive testimony and public comment the Commission has received to date. Of course, the fact that the Commission has heard certain perspectives from witness does not in any way mean the Commission's recommendations will or will not adopt the points of view presented in the report.

By publishing this staff report, the Commission desires to provide individuals and organizations who have given us input an opportunity to confirm that their key messages have been heard or to highlight something that may have been missed, and to give those who are following the work of the Commission, but who have not yet provided input, an opportunity to raise issues they believe the Commission should consider as it prepares its report.

The Commission will use this report and comments received to help guide its examination of options as it develops a draft set of recommendations for the Secretary. Please note that this report summarizes the major themes the Commission has heard thus far; therefore the treatment of issues in the Commission's draft and final reports might be expanded or refined in light of future testimony, public comment and site visits.

The report is available at http://brc.gov/library/reports/BlueRibbon_Report-pages.pdf.

Please send any comments that you may have to brc@nuclear.energy.gov.

Thank you,
Tim

Timothy A. Frazier
Designated Federal Officer
Blue Ribbon Commission on America's Nuclear Future
U.S. Department of Energy Washington, DC

Office: [202-586-4243](tel:202-586-4243)