

sci.energy: Re: Mook's quote about nuclear being a "low grade heat". Is it true?

Re: Mook's quote about nuclear being a "low grade heat". Is it true?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2004-07/0246.html>

From: daestrom (daestrom_at_NO_SPAM_HEREtwcny.rr.com)

Date: 07/07/04

Date: Wed, 07 Jul 2004 01:37:10 GMT

"Scott A Crosby" <scrosby@cs.rice.edu> wrote in message
news:oydwu1hrfwy.fsf@bert.cs.rice.edu...

> On 4 Jul 2004 20:43:37 -0700, william.mook@mokindustries.com (william
mook) writes:

>

>> *I thought them reasonable given the political environment in which
>> they operate. Those references if examined closely can seen to be
>> biased. They discard those plants that in the view of the authors are
>> unreasonably delayed and turned off for insufficiently good reasons.
>> So, they are biased toward rather rosy and optimistic figures – not
>> real world figures with real people and real politicians around.*

>

> *[FYI, I've found this discussion very interesting, but I wish you
> didn't talk through each other as much as you are.]*

>

>

> *I think the problem here is that you are counting externalities as
> costs. If a plant has a social cost of \$2B, that being the amount of
> labor, material, etc needed to construct it, tear it down, and manage
> the waste, but NIMBYism inflates the expense of the plant to \$5B, the
> social cost of the plant remains \$2B, even though the owner has to pay
> the extra externality of \$3B to overcome NIMBY. That externality
> causes the expense of the plant to increase, not the social cost of
> the plant.*

Well, I would use a different term for these numbers. Let us call the \$2B to build a plant an actual 'physical construction cost', and the inflated expenses caused by NIMBYism or other politically motivated delays are the 'social construction cost'.

Yes, and as Mr Mook points out, the *actual* costs are the sum of the two. You must pay them both. To which I counter that the costs in the second category are not so easily predicted. One could spend just a few \$M on public education, and PR and probably change those second category costs dramatical

Re: Mook's quote about nuclear being a "low grade heat". Is it true?