



Dear Mr Hoge,

We read your power point presentation shown to the meeting in Lund with interest. You have clearly been putting a lot of effort into informing yourself.

We have a few comments on the content of your presentation:

1. The costs you quote are early estimate from 2003. We have been working hard to define them more accordingly. Our best estimates after a 4-year study are 1377M€ for total capital costs and 93 M€ p.a. for operating costs.
2. The contribution from international partners will almost certainly not be according to GNP but according to use, defined in advance.
3. The 2.2 B€ you quote is unrecognisable. We presume it is simply speculation?
4. The area of the designated site is ~2.0 km². The footprint of the ESS facility will be 0.7 km².
5. The site will not be donated free of charge.
6. The number of instruments in the reference design is set at 22. Their capital cost is included in the 1377M€.
7. Your “worst-case scenario” is not based upon facts.
8. ESS in Scandinavia is “marketed” as a scientific research facility. Other aspects are of course important but secondary to the principal goal.
9. The European community of researchers who use neutrons is currently ~4500. Over a 3-year period they will all use ESS.
10. The paper in Science from CCLRC on a fusion source of neutrons is very futuristic. It has been discredited as a practical source of neutron beams in the foreseeable future (i.e. at least 50 years ahead) by a large group of scientists.
11. Transmutation of nuclear waste is an idea of The Nobel Prizewinner Carlo Rubbia. Very little work has been done practically o it and it is not a proven technique. The ESS is not designed for, nor will it be used for the transmutation of nuclear waste. We wish to emphasis this categorically.
12. We are baffled by your statement beginning “7 of the 26 neutrons....etc” . What facts do you base this statement on?
13. Every human activity carries with its risks. ESS is no different. These risks will be managed to the highest professional standards and will be monitored by national and international authorized. The scenarios, which you envisage have extremely low probabilities compared to the risks you, expose yourself to daily.

14. Electricity needs are 40 MW and not 120 to 150MW. We aim, intelligent building design to get this need down below 35 MW. We will have a carbon-neutral policy based upon electricity generation by renewals. We are a partner
15. We are currently seeking partners for this project. As you would expect the Nordic countries are parts of our discussions.

In conclusion, we do hope you find our response helpful to you. We do feel that to entitle your presentation “In consistencies in the ESS Project” when your own case is full of inconsistencies itself does not help your argument.

Yours sincerely,
for ESS Scandinavia
Marianne Ekdahl
Communication & Information Officer