cleanenergy.org
Southern Alliance for Clean Energy

Nuclear Power and Global Warming

The Risks of Nuclear Power Tackling Global Warming

For over five decades, nuclear power has diverted major funds away from the development of more benign but powerful forms of energy production and this continues today. But today we are facing the prospects of the most serious issue facing humankind: global warming. In order for nuclear power to make an impact on carbon reductions, official projections show that thousands of new nuclear power plants would need to be built across the globe over the next several decades. To put this in perspective, the U.S. has 104 of the 441 operating nuclear reactors in the world today. According to a recent 2007 Keystone Center fact-finding report on nuclear power, *just to maintain current worldwide nuclear power capacity*, seven to nine new nuclear reactors would be needed per year until 2050. In terms of making a substantial reduction in carbon emissions in the near term, nuclear power is too slow and too costly to be a viable strategy.

Wall Street -- According to the Keystone Center's collaborative, industry-endorsed report, in order to have a significant impact on climate, nuclear power would have to sustain unprecedented growth for several decades.[1] This growth would be extremely costly. The report estimated life-cycle cost of electricity from new nuclear plants might reasonably be between eight to 11 cents per kWh based on recent construction experience and escalation of the price of construction materials.[2] Since the Keystone report was issued, the economics of nuclear power has gotten even worse. The costs of proposed nuclear plants in Florida have skyrocketed. Florida Power& Light cost estimates are now between $12 and $18 billion and Progress Energy Florida estimates are near $17 billion—nearly three times what the utilities estimated just over a year ago. Both utilities propose to use the same Westinghouse AP1000 reactor design TVA intends to build at its Bellefonte site in Alabama; a reactor design that has never been built before anywhere in the world. In comparison, energy efficiency is generally estimated to cost around three cents per kWh.[3] According to the Rocky Mountain Institute, each dollar invested in energy efficiency in the U.S. displaces seven times as much carbon dioxide as a dollar invested in nuclear power.[4]

Water -- Water needs and water consumption rates of nuclear power plants are also problematic. According to national statistics, the electric industry is often a leading, if not the largest, water user in many southern states. Current electricity supplies threaten water resources that affect important aspects of the region's tourism, agriculture, fishing industries and sensitive biodiversity. A comparison of different energy supply technologies shows that water usage from nuclear power plants is much greater than renewable energy supplies and is, in fact, the highest water consumer among all energy technologies.[5] According to TVA's application to the NRC for a combined operating license (COL), the two reactors will withdraw over 71 million gallons of water per day (mgd) from the Tennessee River (via the Guntersville reservoir) and consume, or lose, over 46 mgd, returning only about one third. This represents more water consumption than all public water systems in the Guntersville watershed combined. [6]

The Southeast, often considered to be a water-rich region, is predicted to face increasing threat of drought in coming years based on climate models. Last August, TVA had to shut down one of the Browns Ferry reactors due to thermal loading problems—water drawn from the Tennessee River exceeded a 90 F degree average over 24 hours, amid a blistering heat wave across the Southeast. A TVA spokesman commented, *"We don't believe we've*

---

[1] The Keystone Center, Nuclear Power Joint Fact-Finding Report, June 2007, http://www.keystone.org/. A Pacala/Socolow "wedge" is defined as 25 gigatons of carbon reductions. The Keystone report stated that in order for nuclear power to achieve just one wedge of carbon reductions over the next 50 years would require sustaining the most rapid decade of historical growth in nuclear power for that entire period.
[2] The Keystone Center, Nuclear Power Joint Fact-Finding Report, p. 11.
[3] American Council for an Energy Efficient Economy (ACEEE), Direct Testimony of Bill Prindle for Southern Alliance for Clean Energy, GA 2007 IRP, Docket 24505, May 4, 2007.
[4] Rocky Mountain Institute Newsletter, Vol. XVI, #1, Spring 2000, pp. 15, 25, available at http://www.rmi.org/images/other/Newsletter/NLRMIspring20.pdf
[5] Hoffmann, J., S. Forbes, T. Feeley. U.S. DOE, Estimating Freshwater Needs to Meet 2025 Electrical Generating Capacity Forecasts. June 2004, p. 12.
[6] TVA, Bellefonte Units 3&4 COLA (Environmental Report), Rev 0, Section 2.3.2.2.4, Tables 2.3-32, 3.3-1, & 2.3-31.

ever shut down a nuclear unit because of river temperature." And we're not alone with experiencing the unreliability of nuclear power reactors in drought conditions. Europe has already experienced the unreliability of nuclear power. During the 2006 summer heat wave, nuclear power plants had to shut down across Europe because the water temperatures were too high for safe operation.

Waste -- No nation in the world has yet to open a geologic repository. Our nation's proposed federal repository, Yucca Mountain in Nevada, is severely over budget and decades off schedule and may never open. At current levels of operation the U.S. fleet of reactors is expected to exceed Yucca's capacity by 2010, even if it opened, it would not be large enough to accommodate all of the waste generated from our currently operating nuclear reactors, let alone any new reactors. According to the Keystone Center report, for nuclear power to play a role in carbon reductions, it would require 10 nuclear waste repositories the size of the statutory capacity of Yucca Mountain would be needed to store 713,000 tons of spent fuel worldwide.[7] In terms of reprocessing, the Keystone report determined that the long-term availability of uranium at reasonable prices suggests reprocessing of spent fuel will not be cost-effective in the U.S. in the foreseeable future. Additionally, a fuel cycle with reprocessing and any type of separation will still require a geologic repository for long-term management of nuclear waste.

Weapons -- The level of growth needed to impact global warming would require a global expansion of nuclear power greatly increasing the threat of nuclear proliferation. The safety and security culture in some countries raises concerns about further expansion of nuclear power abroad. The bottom line is that the United States is not going to export nuclear power as a solution to global warming to many in the developing world where energy needs are growing the fastest. Many of these countries, such as Indonesia and Somalia, do not have the security infrastructure to support nuclear materials. Current battles over nuclear proliferation in North Korea and Iran are only the tip of a major iceberg if we position nuclear power as a solution to global warming. We cannot claim nuclear power as a solution in the United States and then prevent it from being an option in the developing world. We need technologies that we can freely share with other emerging countries while demonstrating them at home. Nuclear power simply has too many risks in a post-9/11 world to be a solution to global warming.

Summary

The need for smartly designed, well-implemented utility energy efficiency and renewable energy projects and clean energy incentives is urgent. Betting on nuclear power will consume too many of the limited financial resources needed for rapid expansion of energy efficiency and renewables.

Recommended Resources

1) The Keystone Center's ***Nuclear Power Joint Fact-Finding Report***, June 2007, at http://www.keystone.org/. This report examined a number of key issues including cost, waste, security, and safety regarding the feasibility of using nuclear power as a possible global warming mitigation technology and was written by nuclear industry representatives, environmental and consumer advocates, academics and state officials.

2) ***Carbon Free and Nuclear Free: A Roadmap for U.S. Energy Policy*** by Dr. Arjun Makhijani. As new scientific studies conclude that slowing global warming will require an end to carbon emissions within a few decades, this recently published book offers a detailed plan for how the U.S. can end reliance on fossil fuels without sacrificing economic growth and without the risks of nuclear power. Visit http://www.ieer.org/carbonfree/summary.pdf.

3) Read about the current drought in the Southeast and how the electricity sector impacts our water resources at http://www.cleanenergy.org/programs/hottopic.cfm?ID=84

What You Can Do

Join Southern Alliance for Clean Energy at www.cleanenergy.org and help advance clean, safe, energy solutions across the region that will responsibly address global warming.

P.O. Box 1842
Knoxville, TN 37901
Phone: (865) 637-6055
Toll-free: (866) 522-SACE
Fax: (865) 524-4479

250 Arizona Avenue, NE
Atlanta, GA 30307
Phone: (404) 373-5832
Fax: (770) 234-3909

29 North Market Street
Suite 409
Asheville, NC 28801
Phone: (828) 254-6776
Fax: (828) 254-5466

428 Bull Street
Suite 201
Savannah, GA 31405
Ph/Fax: (912) 201-0354

P.O. Box 1833
Pittsboro, NC 27312
Phone: (919) 545-2920

[7] Defined as one "wedge" of carbon reductions or 25 gigatons in carbon reductions