

Re: NEF claims more nuclear power is not way forward

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.energy/2007-09/msg00043.html>

- *From:* Alex <alexterrell@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 09 Sep 2007 04:15:48 -0700
-

On 31 Aug, 17:13, "daestrom" <daestrom@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

"EnergyForum.cc" <fab...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message

news:1188307286.595929.34720@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

Hello newsgroup members,

This might be of interest to someone:

An environmental think-tank in the UK, New Economics Foundation (NEF), has said that more nuclear power plants in the country is not the way forward for cutting carbon emissions from the power generation sector and reducing the consumption of imported fossil fuels because implementing a nuclear building programme will be slow, expensive and risky. Additionally, it will not have enough of an impact to prevent climate change nor guarantee energy supply security. According to NEF, the cost of building new nuclear reactors is actually triple what is being claimed by supporters of such plans.
Source: Energy Business Review

This news item is brought to you in association with EnergyForum.cc
www.energyforum.cc/forum
Your global energy forum on the net!

While I agree that building nuclear plants is 'slow', and you'd have to build a lot of them if that is the only action you take to reduce CO2

Re: NEF claims more nuclear power is not way forward

emissions, where is the proof that costs are 'actually triple what is being claimed'? Is this political group (NEF) more informed about construction costs? Why are they more 'expert' than the 'experts'??

Nuclear reactors would take five to six years to build for the first of a series, falling to about 3 years after a few have been built.