

TEM
09. 04. 2008
7131/815/208

To the
Finnish Ministry of Trade and Industry
Aleksanterinkatu 4
FIN-00100 Helsinki
Finland

April 7, 2008

Subject: NPP Environmental Assessment by Fennovoima

Dear Minister,

The Independent Salzburg Platform Against Nuclear Dangers (PLAGE) partly joins the Statement by the French network Réseau Sortir du Nucléaire concerning the Fennovoima nuclear power plant project, with a few adjustments.

Any increase of the energy consumption is irresponsible regarding to climate change and finite fossil and nuclear ore, only renewable energy should be accepted as long term primary energy source. This is not the case of nuclear energy (for instance due to finite ore, oil consumption among other during mining, enrichment and transport).

Any money wasted in nuclear project cannot be used in more intelligent ways of producing or saving energy, in that way it has **a negative impact on climate change.**

From the first step (uranium mining), the Fennovoima EPR would pollute. Just see the claims made in France (radioactive particles found in rivers in the Limousin) and in Niger (radioactive dust transported by clouds): the builder of Olkiluoto 3 and possible builder of Olkiluoto 4, Areva, has proved that they are **not able to manage uranium mining in a clean way.**

After 50 years of use of nuclear energy, **no definitive solution has been found for nuclear waste management.** Putting nuclear waste underground (even under sea level!) near the current plant site on the coast in fragmented granite rock is one of the worst "solutions" ever imagined. **It is definitive only in the sense that the waste cannot be retrieved.** The fact that the searchers cannot imagine the consequences of creating a disposal has been shown in the research mine of Asse 2 in Germany: one year before 1988, they were still denying any possibility of water intrusion. Next year they can celebrate the 20th anniversary of **a daily intrusion of 12 cubic meters of water.** In Morsleben (as in Asse 2 as well) they are filling up the mines in order to prevent **possible collapse.** The last time tons of rocks fell down in Morsleben, it was not on nuclear waste. Can we expect to be lucky over thousands of years?

Since April 26th 1986, nobody pretends that a nuclear accident cannot happen. Only France was "able" to "prevent" the nuclear cloud of **Chernobyl** to cross the border. That day, the equivalent of the STUK lost any credibility.

The EPR should be safe due to two so-called improvements: a core catcher... that would be efficient only on low pressure path – probability 3 % – and a catalyser.

Due to gravitation, core and water as well would reach the core catcher. So we would have water in contact with the core at more than 1,000 °C. That way the water would be split in oxygen and hydrogen under stoichiometric condition, i.e. under ideal circumstances for a hydrogen explosion. **The catalyser**, supposed to consume the hydrogen, due to the tremendous production of hydrogen could on the opposite **initiate such an explosion**.

After decades of nuclear power plants running, the nuclear industry is still in a try and catch mode. For such an industry, this is criminal.

Taking an example, last year Vattenfall lost electricity power in Nuclear Power Plant (NPP) Forsmark (Sweden) during nearly half an hour, **loosing any control of the nuclear chain reaction**. They had to replace thousands of defect bolts. You may think that an inspection made by the STUK would have been able to prevent such a bad management, but the building of Olkiluoto 3 shows that **the STUK** did not get aware on time of the utilization of porous concrete and **did accept a gentlemen agreement in which the defect concrete was not replaced**. Olkiluoto 3 is a good example of building being **not under control**, as **completion of the building is postponed each year by another year**.

French law, since after the 9/11 attack, classifies documents on the effects of 9/11-like terrorist attacks on nuclear plants. The fact that Réseau Sortir du Nucléaire, under the menace of punishment in court, is not allowed to publicise an official document is holds on this aspect, shows that the French NPPs, among them the planned EPR (at Flamanville), would not stand such an attack. The 6 lines quoting the corresponding paragraph in an open letter of the Réseau Sortir du nucléaire for the hearing on the planned NPP Flamanville 3 were censored. Nevertheless you can easily find the document on the internet. EDF states that the dangerous height, angle and speed for crushing a passenger flight on a NPP (low landing) can be easily achieved for NPPs on coastal sites. So the **Fennovoima NPP would "suit" the requirement for being attacked by an air plane**. Nobody can predict that Finland will never be subject to terrorism. In another Scandinavian country, who thought Olof Palme would be killed?

Not only for the reasons given, but also for others like sustainable development, economic policy and so on, PLAGE Salzburg asks that you deny any authorisation of new EPR build in Finland, especially on the coast.

Looking forward to your answer, I remain,
Yours sincerely,

on behalf of PLAGE:
Prof. Mag. Heinz Stockinger, Chair.