

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
GNEP PEIS
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING
March 1, 2007
6:00 p.m.
Hilltop House Best Western
400 Trinity Drive
Los Alamos, New Mexico

REPORTED BY: Jan A. Williams, RPR, CCR 14
Bean & Associates, Inc.
Professional Court Reporting Service
500 Marquette, Northwest, Suite 280
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

(3624B) JAW

1 MR. BROWN: Good evening. Welcome to this
2 public scoping meeting on the Programmatic
3 Environmental Impact Statement for the Global Nuclear
4 Energy Partnership. The development of an
5 environmental impact statement for this project by the
6 Department of Energy, Office of Nuclear Energy, is
7 required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

8 My name is Holmes Brown, I will serve as the
9 facilitator for this event. My role is to ensure that
10 the meeting runs on schedule and that everybody has an
11 opportunity to speak. I'm not an employee of the
12 Department of Energy nor an advocate for any
13 particular party or position.

14 At the registration table, you should have
15 received a participant's packet. If not, please raise
16 your hand and staff will bring you one. It contains
17 important information on the presentation and is a
18 convenient place to take notes during the briefing
19 that will follow in a few minutes.

20 There are three purposes for tonight's
21 meeting. First, to provide information on the content
22 of the proposed Programmatic Environmental Impact
23 Statement, PEIS, and on the National Environmental
24 Policy Act, NEPA, which governs the process; second,
25 to answer any of your questions about the PEIS or

1 NEPA; and third, to receive and record your formal
2 comments on the scope of the proposed PEIS. The
3 agenda for tonight's meeting reflects these three
4 purposes.

5 We will begin with a video presentation by
6 Dennis Spurgeon, Assistant Secretary for Nuclear
7 Energy, the Department of Energy. Next we will hear a
8 presentation from Mr. Richard Black regarding the
9 proposed Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
10 for the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership. Mr. Black
11 is the Associate Deputy Assistant Secretary For
12 Nuclear Energy.

13 To answer your questions, project staff will
14 be available throughout the evening at the display
15 tables in the room across the hall. They can discuss
16 the proposed PEIS NEPA, the contents of the printed
17 materials available on display, and the contents of
18 Mr. Black's presentation.

19 Following Mr. Black's presentation, we will
20 recess so that the public may pursue further questions
21 with available project staff. Once we reconvene, a
22 court reporter is available to receive your comments
23 and suggestions regarding the scope of the proposed
24 PEIS. All your comments will be transcribed and made
25 part of the permanent record.

1 We will begin with a video presentation by
2 DOE's Dennis Spurgeon.

3 (Video is played.)

4 MR. BROWN: I am now pleased to introduce
5 Mr. Richard Black who is the Associate Deputy
6 Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Energy for the
7 Department of Energy. He will discuss the background
8 of the project and the purpose and basic elements of
9 the proposed Programmatic Environmental Impact
10 Statement.

11 MR. BLACK: Thank you, Holmes. Let me get
12 this microphone on here.

13 Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I
14 certainly would like to add my welcome to you here
15 tonight to attend this, the department's public
16 scoping meeting for the Global Nuclear Energy
17 Partnership. As Assistant Secretary Spurgeon
18 indicated, this meeting is really for you.

19 It is a public scoping meeting where you have
20 the opportunity to present your comments, your
21 statements, your suggestions regarding the scope of
22 this proposal including any reasonable alternatives to
23 the proposal as well as impacts that you might feel
24 could be here to you, the community, or the
25 surrounding environment.

1 We are here tonight -- and it's a little bit
2 different than what Assistant Secretary Spurgeon said.
3 But we are here tonight because Los Alamos National
4 Lab was selected by the department as a possible host
5 for one of the facilities in the GNEP proposal, and
6 that's the research and development facility which
7 I'll talk about later.

8 So that's the reason we're here tonight. So
9 you are one of 13 communities that were selected by
10 DOE for further studies.

11 Your comments, your statements here tonight
12 will be considered as we go through that process. And
13 as we said this was the first part of that process.
14 We have a fairly long process here. This is one of
15 the first steps in that process that leads to an
16 informed decision by the department based on a good
17 sound record.

18 Before we provide the opportunity to make
19 statements, let me describe how we wish to proceed
20 tonight. First of all I would like to talk about what
21 I call nuclear power basics, Basics 101, and also
22 spent fuel management. I want to talk about the NEPA
23 process and how that provides an infrastructure for us
24 to make a sound decision with respect to the GNEP
25 proposal.

1 I also talk about the GNEP proposal, its
2 objectives, and its facilities that will not only
3 possibly be located here at Los Alamos but also the
4 facilities that we are proposing domestically.

5 And then I also want to talk about how we're
6 going to get to that proposal and how we're going to
7 get to that decision through the Programmatic
8 Environmental Impact Statement that we have selected
9 as the vehicle for getting a sound decision for the
10 Secretary to make that decision. So I'll talk about
11 that schedule too.

12 Basically here is nuclear power basics just
13 to give you a broad overview. In the United States
14 now, nuclear power provides 20 percent of our domestic
15 electricity. Nuclear power reactors as Assistant
16 Secretary Spurgeon said do not emit air pollution or
17 greenhouse gases.

18 And the nuclear power reactors provide 70
19 percent of such emission free production electricity
20 in the United States. The other 30 percent is hydro
21 power, a little bit of wind, a little bit of solar.

22 A typical commercial nuclear power plant
23 generates electricity by the fissioning or splitting
24 of uranium. Here we have a uranium fuel nuclear
25 reactor. Once the control rods are removed, removed

1 with the reactor fuel, the fissioning process starts.

2 The fissioning process creates energy.

3 The energy is transferred to water that goes
4 through the core. The water then is transported over
5 to a steam generator, where steam is produced by the
6 boiling water or the water under tremendous heat.

7 And the steam then goes to outside
8 containment over to a turbine building, where the
9 turbines are turned by the steam. And in turn the
10 electrical generator is turned by the turbine that
11 produces electricity that goes on the grid.

12 After completing an operating cycle typically
13 of 18 to 24 months, some uranium fuel in the core is
14 considered used up or spent and must be replaced with
15 fresh fuel. Not all fuel is replaced at one time, but
16 it's done in stages, one element at a time or several
17 elements at a time.

18 When that fuel is removed from the reactor
19 right now, in the United States we have a once-through
20 process, where the fuel is removed from the reactor,
21 put into a spent fuel pool at the reactor site. It's
22 stored there for a period of time, until it can safely
23 be removed from the pool. And currently right now
24 it's stored on-site in dry cask storage containers.

25 This is what we do in the United States,

1 several other countries do it as well, it's called the
2 once-through cycle for spent fuel management. And
3 ultimately you'll notice we're going to deep six that
4 spent fuel in a geologic repository for ultimate
5 disposal which is now considered to be Yucca Mountain,
6 Nevada.

7 The GNEP proposal, as we talked about in the
8 video, is the recycling. It's a different type of
9 spent fuel management, where we recognize that that
10 spent fuel has tremendous energy left in it and also
11 gives us a way to reduce the waste. This is a
12 close-up of it. The back end of the fuel cycle is now
13 being closed and will continuously recycle the
14 reusable constituents in that fuel.

15 What is the thing that is driving us to think
16 of the GNEP initiative at this point. Well, worldwide
17 electricity demand is expected to double in
18 approximately three or four decades, let's say several
19 decades, the 2030 might be 2040 or 2050 in terms of
20 doubling electricity demand.

21 But certainly we know that the economies of
22 the world, witness China and India, are expanding
23 dramatically. And their need for electricity is
24 likewise expanding dramatically. So the U.S. wants to
25 be part of this in terms of, if countries want to

1 pursue the nuclear option, we want to make sure that
2 we can provide them increased energy from diverse
3 sources in ways that protect and improve the
4 environment and enhance our nation's energy security.
5 We'll talk about that in a little bit.

6 Here is the NEPA process that I talked about.
7 NEPA requires consideration of potential environmental
8 impacts of major federal actions. It involves public
9 input. It's very crucial for us as I said to make a
10 very sound record for the Secretary's decision-making
11 on this important proposal.

12 An environmental impact statement is that
13 record that we develop on the environmental impacts of
14 the proposed actions. And in this case we are
15 choosing to use a vehicle called the Programmatic
16 Environmental Impact Statement because this initiative
17 involves a broad program of things, multiple
18 facilities at multiple sites, domestic implications as
19 well as foreign implications.

20 So we feel the best vehicle to do that is
21 through a Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
22 that I'll talk about in a little bit. But here we are
23 in the process, we're in the public scoping process.
24 To get to this point, we noticed some intents of what
25 we were going to do with GNEP.

1 We're going to be issuing a draft
2 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement in the
3 summer of 2007. And your statements or comments here
4 tonight will be part of that draft. But you'll also
5 get another opportunity to comment on that draft when
6 it comes out in the fall. Public comments are due in
7 the fall of 2007.

8 That will lead to a final Programmatic
9 Environmental Impact Statement late spring of 2008.
10 And now we're estimating a record of decision by the
11 Secretary of Energy in June of 2008.

12 The purpose of the GNEP Programmatic
13 Environmental Impact Statement is to assess the
14 reasonable alternatives that will encourage the
15 expansion of worldwide use of nuclear energy, reduce
16 the nuclear proliferation risks, and reduce the
17 volume, the thermal output, and the radiotoxicity of
18 spent fuel before disposal at Yucca Mountain.

19 What are the programmatic alternatives we
20 have under consideration? Well, the first alternative
21 is to continue the once-through fuel cycle. That's
22 what we do now at 103 reactors in the United States.
23 The reactors will generate spent fuel. They will
24 store it safely and on-site until it can be deposited
25 in the geologic repository. But we will also continue

1 to do research and development on nuclear fuel cycle
2 and advanced nuclear fuel cycle technologies.

3 The alternative programming opener, No. 2,
4 the GNEP proposal action, it's a broad implementation
5 of a closed fuel cycle that could include one or more
6 nuclear fuel recycling centers or one or more advanced
7 recycling reactors that I'll talk about in the next
8 two slides.

9 As Assistant Secretary Spurgeon indicated,
10 we're looking at three types of facilities here. The
11 first facility is a nuclear fuel recycling center.
12 This center will separate spent fuel under reasonable
13 uranium and the transuranics as Assistant Secretary
14 Spurgeon mentioned. Neptunium, plutonium, americium,
15 and curium are the transuranics. And we'll also
16 separate out the waste without separating out the pure
17 plutonium.

18 Our advanced technology right now is that the
19 plutonium will come out and be separated, but it won't
20 be separated out in a pure form. And why is that
21 important? Because pure plutonium is weapons grade
22 fuel. And it could be used without too much more
23 processing to develop a nuclear weapon. And this is
24 one of the objectives of GNEP, is to reduce that
25 proliferation by advanced technologies.

1 The advanced recycling reactor will take fuel
2 that will be fabricated in the recycling center. And
3 the fuel fabrication will be done in such a way that
4 the transuranics will be in the fuel. And, as it's
5 burned in the reactor, it will burn it up or consume
6 those transuranics.

7 The proposed technology is a sodium cooled
8 fast reactor. We are mentioning this because we have
9 actually developed these types of reactors and
10 employed them at DOE sites in the past. So we are
11 familiar with the technology.

12 The PEIS will analyze alternative power
13 ratings for the reactor from 250 to 2,000 megawatts.
14 And I forgot to mention that we're going to be looking
15 at different throughputs for the recycling center too.

16 At the small end of those throughputs, that
17 would indicate that we're probably going to build a
18 recycling center and a recycling reactor for kind of
19 like an engineering demonstration of the technologies.
20 At the more higher ends of these throughputs, that
21 would indicate more of a commercial type enterprise
22 for both the recycling center and the recycling
23 reactor.

24 So the footnote indicates down here that
25 these two facilities could be privately owned and

1 operated. We're going to look at the commercial
2 feasibility of operating these two facilities
3 potentially with government supplied incentives.

4 But basically the American industry will look
5 at this and say we think that we can do this, we think
6 we can make money at it, we think that we can help the
7 United States and, DOE, will you help us do it. And
8 those are the considerations that we will be looking
9 at in the environmental impact statement.

10 The advanced fuel cycle research facility.
11 This is the facility that could possibly be located
12 here in Los Alamos National Lab. It will support
13 research and development relating to separation
14 technologies. As I indicated we are looking at
15 advanced technologies for the separation of spent fuel
16 into the uranium parts and the transuranic parts.

17 We know that we have -- we've looked at a
18 process called urex and another one called coex. And
19 exes mean extraction. So we're looking at chemical
20 extraction of the reusable constituents of the spent
21 fuel.

22 This recycling research facility will also be
23 the first one to fabricate the fuel, the first fuel
24 bunch for the advanced recycling reactor. But this
25 research facility will also be looking at advanced

1 technologies for fuel fabrication in the future.

2 This research facility also will be a world
3 class research center. We would get scientists from
4 around the world to help us do advanced fuel cycle
5 research. We want to restore DOE and U.S. leadership
6 in this important endeavor. So this is an important
7 research facility. And this will be built and
8 operated at a DOE site such as Los Alamos.

9 Here are the following sites that I
10 indicated. We have 13 sites, the DOE sites that are
11 under consideration are the ones down in the left-hand
12 side here. The non-DOE sites, there are two in New
13 Mexico, Hobbs and Roswell, that will be used -- that
14 we will put into consideration in the environmental
15 impact statement screening process.

16 Now, the screening process is where we're at
17 right now. And we're going to have screening
18 criteria, that maybe some of these sites up here do
19 not meet some of the criteria that we're looking for.
20 We're looking at safety criteria, we're looking at
21 security criteria, we're looking at infrastructure
22 criteria for all these sites to make sure that they
23 can host these facilities in a safe secure manner.

24 So maybe one or more of these sites will not
25 be -- will not be recommended for further siting

1 studies through the screening process.

2 Here are the sites that -- here are the
3 possibilities. And here you can see that LANL is only
4 going to be looked at for the research facility. Some
5 of the DOE sites, like Idaho we're going to look at
6 for all three facilities. And here is the DOE site, I
7 mentioned this before.

8 What is the international aspect of GNEP?
9 And I think this is important to all of us. We're
10 going to work with our partner nations. When I say
11 partner nations, there are five or six nations right
12 now that have advanced nuclear technologies. And
13 they're actually marketing those technologies like
14 reactors to other nations that want them.

15 So we want to partner with them to develop a
16 program that will supply fuel to these nations that
17 want the nuclear reactor option to produce
18 electricity. But we're going to work with our partner
19 nations such as Great Britain, Japan, Russia, the
20 French.

21 So, when we do give reactor technology to a
22 developing nation let's say, we will assure them of a
23 fuel supply if they refrain or agree not to pursue
24 uranium enrichment and reprocessing programs that
25 could possibly potentially lead to the development of

1 a nuclear weapon.

2 So this is a fuel management program where we
3 will agree to give them -- supply them fuel. We're
4 not giving them fuel, we're supplying them fuel in an
5 agreement to take it back and reprocess it. Anyway --
6 I lost my mike.

7 So the other part of this international
8 program, the partnership, is the reactor program.
9 We're in the process of developing what we call safe
10 secure reactors. These are going to be right size
11 reactors meaning they're a little smaller reactors,
12 from 300 to 500 megawatts. They will be modular in
13 the sense that, if you need more electricity than 300
14 to 500 megawatts, you can put them in groups, one or
15 more.

16 They probably can be -- much of it can be
17 fabricated off-site and shipped on-site for
18 fabrication. And we're working with our partner
19 nations right now to develop that technology. It will
20 be based on an advanced technology, inherently safe
21 and secure technology.

22 We are not proposing any specific action with
23 respect to these international initiatives. Those
24 will be borne out with future deliberations between
25 the partner nations. But, in the GNEP PEIS, we will

1 be looking at in a general quantitative way the
2 potential impacts to the U.S. regarding this type of
3 program.

4 In the environmental impact statement, these
5 are the typical environmental issues that we looked
6 at. They're really impacts to people, they're impacts
7 to property, they're impacts to the environment, and
8 they're impacts for the infrastructure of a community,
9 socioeconomic impacts.

10 And we have also found that, as we have gone
11 out to these public scoping meetings, people like you
12 people here tonight also have indicated there may be
13 some other local issues that we did not consider in
14 this list here and would be good local impacts that we
15 could -- we should consider in the environmental
16 impact analysis.

17 So that's your chance too tonight to give us
18 some local issues or local concerns that you may have.

19 As I said we are expecting a Secretary's
20 record of decision in June of 2008 to determine
21 whether to proceed with the construction and/or
22 operation of any GNEP recycling facilities and, if so,
23 where will they be located, what technologies they
24 employ, and what throughput they will have.

25 DOE's decision, the Secretary's decision will

1 be based on information from the Programmatic
2 Environmental Impact Statement but also include
3 information from ongoing studies, let's say, where we
4 have ongoing economic studies, we have ongoing studies
5 on technologies that are available as well as policy
6 considerations that must be considered.

7 The National Energy Policy Act gave us an
8 advanced fuel cycle initiative. Congress told to us
9 look at these things. So indeed we're looking at
10 them. But there are other things in the Energy Policy
11 Act, policy considerations that may weigh on the
12 Secretary's decision hereto as to where to locate
13 these facilities or other things that may be
14 considered. So there's a bunch of information that
15 will support the Secretary's decision on GNEP.

16 How can you help us make a sound decision?
17 Well, tonight you can provide comments to us. These
18 will be recorded, they will be part of the public
19 record. You can identify reasonable alternatives to
20 the proposed action, as I indicated environmental
21 issues that you feel should be considered by DOE in
22 their decision-making process.

23 Continue to be informed. Here is a web site
24 that we have established. It is information which
25 will continue to be information rich as we load up

1 more and more information as we go through this
2 process. So stay involved.

3 You can sign up for distribution lists for
4 the draft PEIS and provide us further comments. We
5 may have some other public meetings here in Los Alamos
6 or in the New Mexico area and you can certainly attend
7 those and stay involved.

8 How can you provide your comments? Here
9 tonight you can do it, you can do it by U.S. mail, by
10 email, by telephone, or by fax. And the comment
11 period for this cycle of the scoping process ends
12 April 4, 2007.

13 As indicated you will be able to provide
14 comments on the draft PEIS as it comes out in the
15 summer of 2007. So there will be another comment
16 period.

17 With that, before I say thank you and
18 goodbye, I would like to introduce the point person
19 for the GNEP program who is a former Los Alamos
20 person, Dr. Paul Lisowski at the back of the room.
21 Wave your hand.

22 Dr. Lisowski is the Deputy Assistant
23 Secretary in the Office of Nuclear Energy and really
24 the point person for a lot of the GNEP proposal. He
25 is one of the principal architects I'll say for the

1 GNEP proposal. So he is rich in information as well.
2 And you'll find that out as you talk to him. So I
3 just want to introduce him.

4 But I really want to thank you for your
5 interest and your involvement in this and we're
6 looking forward to your statements tonight and trying
7 to address them as reasonably as we can. Thank you.

8 MR. BROWN: Thanks a lot. At this time we're
9 going to take a break to allow you the opportunity to
10 pose further questions to staff who will be available
11 at the display tables in the adjoining room and also
12 to DOE personnel who will also join us in that room.

13 I will make an announcement at the conclusion
14 of the question and answer period to reconvene here.
15 At that time we will begin taking formal comments for
16 the public record. If you haven't signed up yet and
17 would like to make a public statement, please see
18 Jackie at the table right over here and sign up.

19 And with that we will take a break now to
20 answer questions and reconvene soon. Thank you.

21 (Break)

22 MR. BROWN: Let's get started with the public
23 comment portion. Thanks very much. It's now time to
24 receive your formal comments on the scope of the
25 proposed PEIS. This is your opportunity to let the

1 Department of Energy know what you would like to see
2 addressed in the draft document.

3 The court reporter will transcribe your
4 statement. Our reporter for tonight is Jan Williams.
5 Welcome.

6 Let me review a few ground rules for the
7 formal comments. Please step up to the microphone
8 over there when your name is called, introduce
9 yourself, providing an organizational affiliation,
10 where appropriate.

11 If you have a written version of your
12 statement, if you could leave a copy with the court
13 reporter when you've completed your remarks, that will
14 provide for even greater accuracy in your comments.

15 Also, if you have any other materials that
16 you would like to submit to be included in the record
17 but don't intend to read, you can leave those at the
18 at the same time and those will be marked and
19 submitted for the record. I'll call two names at a
20 time, first the person who will be speaking and second
21 the person to follow.

22 In view of the number of folks who have
23 signed up to speak tonight, I think we'll have a
24 five-minute rule, that you will have five minutes to
25 complete your statement. I will let you know when

1 you're at the four-minute mark. So, if you still have
2 a fair amount left, you perhaps can summarize those.

3 I should note that all comments are
4 considered equal. Dick had indicated there are about
5 five or six ways in which you can submit comments.
6 None of them hold any more weight than another. In
7 other words, the printed comments, emailed comments,
8 and spoken comments all get equal consideration.

9 Mr. Black will be serving as the hearing
10 officer for tonight's meeting during the formal
11 comment period, but he will not be taking any
12 questions or comments during this period.

13 So with that, by way of introduction, let me
14 call the name of the first person who signed up to
15 speak and the next. I think William Strattan is the
16 first person signed up and Don Davidson will follow.

17 MR. STRATTAN: Thank you. Am I coming
18 through? Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 My name is William Strattan. I'm a resident
20 of Los Alamos, I'm also a member of the local group
21 known as the Los Alamos Education Group.

22 And I'm here to speak in favor of the
23 proposal by the Department of Energy and their Global
24 Nuclear Energy Partnership program to recycle spent
25 fuel, separate the uranium and transuranics from the

1 fission products, and reuse the heavy elements in new
2 fuel.

3 A resurgence of the construction and
4 operation of new light water nuclear power plants is
5 absolutely necessary and certainly is about to start.
6 The GNEP program is a necessary part of the whole
7 nuclear electric power industry.

8 The uranium and transuranics will be
9 chemically separated from the spent fuel and will be
10 made into new fuel and used mostly in new fast
11 neutron, so-called burner reactors as well as some
12 limited use in existing light water reactors.

13 This plan has several major advantages in the
14 long run for electric power production in the United
15 States and elsewhere. First, by long term is meant
16 not generations or even centuries but for the
17 indefinite future. The existing thermal neutron
18 reactors use only a small fraction of the total
19 fission energy available in uranium.

20 This unused energy can be obtained only from
21 the use of the fast neutron reactor, the so-called
22 burner reactor, cooled most commonly by sodium,
23 although other coolants are possible.

24 These so-called fast neutrons can fission the
25 higher isotopes of plutonium, americium, cerium, and

1 other transuranics that are created by operation of
2 all reactors. These transuranics act as a neutron
3 poison in the water reactors, but are a perfectly good
4 source of fission energy in the fast neutron reactor.

5 Second, the caring for only fission products
6 will ease the disposal requirements by orders of
7 magnitude and will be much, much less expensive than
8 the disposal of the entire fuel element. The major
9 technical problem at Yucca Mountain is the heat
10 generated by the heavier isotopes.

11 The major radiation hazard from fission
12 products derives from the cesium and strontium
13 isotopes. Their half-life is about 30 years, so by
14 ten half lives or 300 years the hazard they present is
15 gone.

16 Special cases are iodine 129 and technetium
17 99. Technetium is the element often used in hospitals
18 for medical diagnoses. There's a real possibility
19 that commercial uses of the metals in the fission
20 products will be fine, but this remains to be seen.

21 Thus, in a real sense, this proposal to
22 reprocess spent fuel and use the heavy elements for
23 more fission energy in new fuel is a phoenix-like
24 event or process. It literally takes the ashes of the
25 spent fuel and creates new fuel and can do this same

1 trick again and again just like the legendary Egyptian
2 bird. The French have so labeled their sodium cooled
3 reactor the Phoenix.

4 Thus recycle and reuse capability can solve
5 the problem of as some people believe a limited amount
6 of uranium said to exist in the world. Some studies
7 suggest that, in 50 or 75 years, the price of uranium
8 ore will rise very sharply and supplies may very well
9 be limited.

10 Lots of uranium exists in the ocean at a
11 price unknown but probably prohibitive. The fast
12 neutron reactor is necessary for energy supply if the
13 burning of carbon based fuels is to be restricted
14 because of carbon dioxide as now seems to be the case.

15 To begin this program to provide a truly
16 long-term source of energy will not be inexpensive.
17 In fact, to get started will be very costly. However,
18 I point to the enormous cost of Yucca Mountain, many
19 billions with no end in site and not even a license
20 much less any actual storage.

21 The money saved by storing only fission
22 products go a long way to starting the recycle process
23 and construction of prototype fast reactors. The time
24 to start is now. We have lost 30 years, nearly
25 one-third of a century since Jimmy Carter's bad

1 decision. We should not waste any more time. Thank
2 you.

3 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Don Davidson.

4 MR. DAVIDSON: Thank you.

5 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry. Robert Jefferson
6 Bartholomew will be next after you.

7 MR. DAVIDSON: My name is Don Davidson. I
8 presently chair the Los Alamos Education Group. I
9 would like first to thank the members of the
10 Department of Energy and the current administration
11 for rising to the occasion. As Bill Strattan alluded
12 to, we have sort of let by for 30 years and failed to
13 recognize the possibility of mining these, quote,
14 unquote, waste materials for their potential energy.

15 I am strongly in favor of the program. I
16 will not address any further technical details, I will
17 leave that to those who are more capable who will
18 follow. Thank you very much.

19 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Robert Bartholomew
20 and Cheryl Rofer is next.

21 MR. BARTHOLOMEW: Thank you for the
22 opportunity to talk to this group. For the first time
23 in about 30 years, I am now re-encouraged as I started
24 my career in nuclear energy development here at Los
25 Alamos National Laboratory about 30 years ago.

1 And I do strongly agree that the program as
2 stated, except for alternative one, needs to be
3 pursued. I also believe that it is the safest as far
4 as the global aspects to the environment. Everything
5 I hear these days refers to alternative fuels, things
6 like that, or coal.

7 And these kinds of fuel components are nearly
8 all very, very carbon emissive intensive. Nuclear is
9 not. My background at the laboratory included studies
10 nearly every one of these fields, especially the
11 closing of the nuclear fuel cycle which was developed
12 as everyone knows during the Carter Administration.

13 And I even got involved in what I consider to
14 be a complete waste of time and money in trying to
15 design fuel casks and test them and hold them on
16 railroad cars so they can be safely taken to another
17 huge facility to sit there.

18 And so I think those options have already
19 been tried. What we do need is what has been
20 announced and at least initially dealt with by
21 Dr. Strattan. And my own comments will certainly
22 emphasize that.

23 One option that I have that seems to have
24 been neglected is the high temperature gas reactor
25 concept, which I did some work to license the one in

1 Colorado. I've forgotten its name. Fort St. Fran,
2 yes. And I believe that concept is one that should
3 not be excluded in the utilization of nuclear power.

4 We should not develop another watt of
5 electricity, really, that's how I feel about it,
6 without the use of nuclear power. And that ought to
7 be the powerful incentive for this next century.

8 I believe that's about all I want to say at
9 this time. However, if I may use the privilege that
10 congressmen always do, I would like to revise and
11 extend my remarks since I'm quite encouraged with this
12 program.

13 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thank you. Cheryl, you're
14 next. Glen Graves will follow Cheryl.

15 MS. ROFER: Thank you. I'm speaking as a
16 private citizen today. I've worked at the laboratory
17 for 35 years and I hold a patent in reprocessing
18 technology.

19 I feel that the United States will need to
20 expand its nuclear power in the future, but I have
21 concerns about the Global Nuclear Energy Partnership.
22 First, what is available on the GNEP web site is
23 extremely thin technically so it is hard to discuss
24 the proposal intelligently.

25 Second, the United States has refrained from

1 civilian reprocessing, what the GNEP called recycling
2 for 30 years, and has lost its expertise in this area.
3 It has also built no nuclear power plants during that
4 time.

5 Third, the United States has lost credibility
6 as a world leader by ignoring world opinion in its
7 attack on Iraq. For these second and third reasons,
8 it is in a poor position to lead the global
9 partnership with such sensitive ramifications as
10 provision of nuclear fuel to other countries. No
11 country will easily entrust its energy security to
12 another.

13 Fourth, I must question the motivation for
14 this program. It was announced shortly after Mohamed
15 ElBaradei of the International Atomic Energy Agency
16 proposed an international nuclear fuel bank led by the
17 United Nations.

18 The United Nations would be a more credible
19 leader for such an effort and would be more likely to
20 draw the collaboration of many nations. One must
21 wonder if the announcement of the GNEP was intended to
22 undermine any effort in this area by the United
23 Nations.

24 All of these points must be addressed before
25 the GNEP can have my backing. Thank you.

1 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Glen Graves is next.
2 And Ted Wyka will follow.

3 MR. GRAVES: I'm going to switch my glasses.
4 I'm Glen Graves, I'm a retired scientist at the Los
5 Alamos National Laboratory. I have worked in nuclear
6 research in different ways, from critical assemblies
7 in nuclear rocket propulsion and studied energy R&D
8 policy both here and in the director's office and the
9 present science advisor's office in Washington and
10 worked with the International Atomic Energy Agency as
11 head of the physics section.

12 I heartily approve the purposes and the
13 announced intentions of the GNEP. To get more of the
14 energy out of the spent fuel, we have to return that
15 to simplify waste handling to reduce the problem of
16 being a problem of perhaps a million years down to a
17 problem of a few hundred years.

18 And to spread the benefits to the rest of the
19 world of this nuclear technology which, if properly
20 controlled, is one of the only and perhaps most
21 important ways that we're going to get out of the
22 carbon mix or mess that we have with greenhouse gases.

23 There are some things that I want to talk a
24 little bit about how this affects the U.S. energy
25 supply and talk about the waste situation that we

1 have.

2 Many of you may or may not know that our
3 current light water reactor fuel cycles are very poor
4 in their utilization of energy of the uranium that we
5 mine. Out of every 150 tons of uranium that we mine,
6 roughly one ton is fission ultimately in a light water
7 reactor. And that's because, when we try to separate
8 the U235, the part that is comparatively easy to put
9 in reactors to produce energy, it's a small percentage
10 of the national uranium.

11 And, when we separate that by the enrichment
12 process, we leave about six times, five to six times
13 as many tons of uranium in the form of what are called
14 tails at the enrichment plant as anything that ever
15 gets fabricated into fuel.

16 And, when we fabricate something into, say,
17 30 tons of fuel, we wind up over the course of that
18 product being in the reactor fissioning about one ton
19 of it. So you find out that perhaps we're utilizing
20 1/150th of the energy we have there.

21 The purpose of this kind of a fast reactor
22 system that's being discussed would be to recycle
23 these elements back. And we would use those over and
24 over and would manage to effectively fission most of
25 that.

1 And that's a very significant gain. It's a
2 significant gain in the world of how different
3 countries would feel about their relative energy
4 independence and how we in this country would feel
5 about ours.

6 It's interesting to note that the uranium we
7 have mined, if it were used in a system of this kind,
8 probably is already adding to supply several hundred
9 1,000 megawatt power reactors for several hundred
10 years.

11 We may tend to forget how significant the
12 gain is in nuclear energy. I brought along this
13 little role of nickels as an illustration of a certain
14 point. If this were uranium, 40 nickels in here, or
15 plutonium or thorium and it were completely fissioned,
16 you would have enough energy generated by this process
17 to supply the lifetime energy of an average person in
18 the United States on a per capita basis for 80 years.
19 In other words, that's your lifetime supply of energy.

20 And the fission products that would be
21 generated by such a process would be the same size as
22 this roll of nickels would be. And properly separated
23 into waste and bottled up with glass that it's
24 proposed that they would be embedded with, the whole
25 waste that you would generate to satisfy your energy

1 needs over a lifetime would fit into a soda can.

2 So that's the monstrous waste problem that
3 people talk about that we have. Waste is really a
4 very small problem and it's definitely not something
5 that can't be coped with.

6 The other thing to think about is that every
7 year annually we unload, in the spent fuel we take out
8 of reactors and so-called spent fuel, energy
9 equivalent to a couple of Prudhoe Bays. So this is
10 really a significant thing if you want to expand
11 energy availability in the country and expand it with
12 a carbon free greenhouse gas and a fairly simple waste
13 problem.

14 So I think all the countries in the world can
15 benefit from this. And we have a great opportunity,
16 if we can implement this program, maybe to restore the
17 leadership that Cheryl spoke about that has been sadly
18 or rather badly damaged in the past. Thank you.

19 MR. BROWN: Thank you. I've created a
20 problem. In fact, Alva Morrison is our next speaker.
21 And John Witham will follow.

22 MR. MORRISON: Yes, my name is Alva Morrison,
23 I'm a resident of Dixon, New Mexico, and I'm a member
24 of the Embudo Valley Environmental Monitoring Network.
25 I'm just speaking for myself here tonight.

1 I'm here in support of the no action
2 alternative. The reason being that what this looks
3 like to me is an attempt to resurrect a nightmare of
4 reprocessing from the dust bin of history. And it's
5 time to nip it in the bud before it gets any further.

6 I think we've got enough West Valleys, we've
7 got enough Hanfords, we've got enough Savannah Rivers,
8 you know, we know what's going on with reprocessing.
9 And we very intelligently forgot about it. We haven't
10 done anything with the mess that we've made from it.

11 But certainly, for a Programmatic
12 Environmental Impact Statement, all the factors need
13 to be in place to avoid the disasters we have already
14 incurred before we proceed. In other words, we have
15 to have a complete -- we have to know what the
16 technology is that we're going to be using which I
17 don't see anywhere here in these materials we've been
18 provided.

19 We need to know what waste streams are going
20 to come out, we need to know volume, we need to know
21 radioactivity, and we need to know what the handling
22 system is going to be, because what I'm seeing here is
23 that the term recycling is being bandied around.

24 But, in fact, what I see in the use of that
25 term is that it's really a PR effort, because, in

1 fact, what we're doing is not recycling. We're
2 increasing the problem, we're making it more expensive
3 and more environmentally difficult to handle. By
4 dissolving fuel rods in acid, turning them into
5 liquid, you're then making them more difficult to deal
6 with.

7 So what I see -- what I'm going to ask here
8 is that, in the Programmatic Environmental Impact
9 Statement and in all proceedings hereafter, that we
10 eliminate the term recycling because it's not
11 accurate.

12 We also had another inaccurate statement from
13 the Department of Energy at the beginning, that
14 nuclear reactors don't create air pollution. Anybody
15 who has been involved in licensing proceedings for a
16 nuclear facility or a nuclear reactor knows that's not
17 accurate. So please eliminate that from your
18 presentation, sir, if you would.

19 So here in Los Alamos we're concerned about
20 this potential research facility. In New Mexico we
21 have the possibility of the actual fuel rod dissolving
22 facility or even possibly a reactor. I don't see how
23 that could physically take place here. But, if
24 anybody can do it, you know, if anybody can find the
25 water for it, I've got an oceanfront property in

1 Albuquerque I'll sell you.

2 But we're dealing with the Programmatic
3 Environmental Impact Statement. So here are the
4 things that we need to know. And we need to know
5 these things for the research facility and we need to
6 know them for the waste dissolving facility and we
7 also need to know them for this imagined but not
8 really defined fast reactor facility too.

9 We need to know in the Programmatic
10 Environmental Impact Statement the volume and the
11 radioactivity for each waste stream that's going to
12 come from these facilities. And we need to know that
13 because, if we don't, we're going to end up with
14 another Hanford, with leaky tanks, and they've got to
15 stick a remote camera down the tank and then they find
16 out, oh, my gosh, it was full two years ago, what
17 happened to it now. It's half empty. And we don't
18 even know where all that high level waste went.

19 Okay. We need to know what the chain of
20 custody is going to be for these waste streams all the
21 way down the line to final deposition for anything
22 that's not going to go into this fast reactor. And we
23 need to know what the final deposition is going to be,
24 we need to know exactly what technology is going to be
25 used.

1 I'm presuming somebody has some idea how
2 they're going to be taking it from liquid to solid
3 form, but I don't see it. We've got to have that in
4 the EIS before we proceed. And especially for New
5 Mexico, for both of these facilities, research and
6 waste dissolving facility, we need to know what the
7 water use is going to be.

8 We need to know how the water rights are
9 going to be acquired. And, for the liquid waste, how
10 that's going to be disposed of. And there's also
11 probably going to be radioactive air pollution. We
12 need to know how much, where, and how that's going to
13 be handled. Thank you very much.

14 MR. BROWN: Thank you. John Witham and
15 Kalliroi Matsakis will be next.

16 MR. WITHAM: I am John Witham with Nuclear
17 West New Mexico. Historically reprocessing reactor
18 irradiated material that took place in this country,
19 in Washington and South Carolina and Idaho, in the
20 forties and through the eighties, are still some of
21 the most polluted places in the Western Hemisphere.
22 And, after billions of dollars spent to clean them up,
23 they still are.

24 In the PEIS I would expect to see a detailed
25 investigation into how the reprocessing waste will be

1 dealt with. And, considering the dismal
2 responsibility that DOE has taken for the already
3 existing reprocessing waste, I would like this to be
4 examined in extreme detail.

5 I'm also concerned by the amount of spent
6 nuclear fuel that will be shipped here to Los Alamos
7 and used to experiment with the development of
8 separation processes. In the PEIS I would expect to
9 see a detailed assessment of the amounts of this
10 material, its transportation, and final disposition of
11 what will remain after the experiments in the process
12 are done. Thank you.

13 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Kalliroi Matsakis.
14 Don Brown will be next.

15 MS. MATSAKIS: My name is Kalliroi Matsakis
16 and I am representing Concerned Citizens For Nuclear
17 Safety and we oppose the GNEP proposal. In the
18 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, please
19 include analysis for environmental justice including
20 the disproportionate impact to native, minority, and
21 low-income populations.

22 New Mexico has the highest majority of
23 minority population in the 48 contiguous states. In
24 addition, New Mexico is one of the poorest states in
25 the country. In this analysis please include

1 synergistic and cumulative impacts including if more
2 than one New Mexico site is chosen for GNEP.

3 Please include analysis for the risks
4 associated with transportation both nationally and
5 internationally. Please include a timeline for the
6 operation of the facilities including an estimate for
7 when R&D will be completed. Please include an
8 historical analysis of the impacts for safety, waste,
9 cost, and environmental impacts from past attempts at
10 reprocessing past reactors in the R&D for
11 transportation.

12 The NOI states that DOE will begin operation
13 of the reprocessing center and advanced reactor prior
14 to the development of technology to reprocess for and
15 fabricate the proposed fast reactor fuel. What
16 processes will be used at the reprocessing facility
17 and advanced reactor prior to the completion of the
18 R&D.

19 The NOI states that DOE will only assess as
20 reasonable alternatives those technologies that do not
21 separate pure plutonium. This must remain true for
22 the technology utilized during the interim period.

23 Please analyze a variety of waste disposal
24 activities. The NOI mentioned the need for geologic
25 (unintelligible). Please include as well a hardened

1 on-site storage facility. Please include a full list
2 of the air pollutants and the levels for the different
3 throughputs.

4 Should operations come to Los Alamos, please
5 include what the impacts will be from the LANCE
6 facility. And please include a clear comparison of
7 activities under GNEP and those under the AFCI. Thank
8 you.

9 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Don Brown. Then Dale
10 Thompson will follow Don.

11 MR. BROWN: My name is Don Brown, and I'm a
12 resident here at Los Alamos. I left the laboratory.
13 And I was the lead auditor for nuclear quality
14 assurance. And the comment that I really have here is
15 kind of a question and a concern.

16 Quality assurance has to be in the forefront
17 of this activity. And I'm concerned about in the past
18 it's been an afterthought. I want -- I would like to
19 see what the quality assurance program will look like
20 for worker safety and public safety and would also
21 would like to see what the interfaces with the Nuclear
22 Regulatory Commission might be on this proposed
23 program. And that's pretty much what I would like to
24 say as a comment.

25 MR. BROWN: Thanks, Don. Dale Thompson.

1 Donald Petersen will follow Dale.

2 MR. THOMPSON: I'm Dale Thompson. And I'm
3 also vice president of the laboratory retirees group.
4 What I have to say here is basically personal
5 experience. I realized, when I was in waste
6 management, that we need to be doing something with
7 our waste.

8 And so I looked around and found a reactor
9 that was built in England that had a unique feature
10 that, while it was running, you could actually refuel
11 it. And sort of a nifty way of doing it. So what I
12 did was just take out the fuel rods and the reflector
13 of carbon rods and replaced that volume with
14 radioactive isotopes from spent waste.

15 Now, the first thing I did was I eliminated
16 all the waste that could be used for nuclear fuel. It
17 turns out that, when the calculations were done, that
18 I had a reactor which in England was about 300
19 megawatts electric. Isotopes, I had a reactor or an
20 isotope reactor that had about the same output.

21 When you step back into this, that means you
22 have approximately that one facility needed 30 nuclear
23 power plants to keep the operation going.

24 People at the lab thought, you know, I had
25 lost it. So they actually had a group do a proposal.

1 And they came back and said, well, you know, Dale,
2 that's not going to be a 1,000 megawatt reactor,
3 that's only going to be 300 megawatt reactor. And I
4 said, oh, my God, you mean I need 100 power plants to
5 make this thing 1,000 megawatts. And they said, oh,
6 absolutely.

7 And I said, well, I'm glad for you all
8 looking into this, since you had more resources than I
9 did. But, you know, how many reactors do we have in
10 the United States? I said couldn't we build that kind
11 of reactor in the United States and take care of all
12 the radioactive isotopes except like I say for the
13 uranium, plutonium, and things like that, because
14 those can be better used.

15 Well, it turned out I happened to be
16 carpooling with a guy that did a lot of mass
17 spectrometry. And I said, well, how can we get all
18 the isotopes separated.

19 Well, the first thing he said was don't put
20 acid on it, on a fuel rod. And so we actually came up
21 and said well, how about if we start out with water,
22 dissolve it in water and start building that up,
23 changing the pH, things like that with lasers and all
24 these new gadgets and things. And by Jove most of
25 that started working.

1 Actually we at that time were interested in
2 how to get rid of the real long-term isotopes. And
3 that's why we wanted to separate each ice -- well,
4 each element. And then by mass spectrometry take out
5 the isotopes that were radioactive.

6 It turns out that we were fortunate to run
7 into a person that was really into the laser business.
8 And, by Jove, you can do that.

9 And so what we actually had proposed and had
10 sent senators and things proposal for it, why don't we
11 do it. And it turns out I'm very happy today that
12 we're making this announcement, because I've been
13 waiting since 1980 to actually make this announcement.

14 So what I'm saying is these people may be
15 headed off in the wrong direction. We've already
16 solved the problem. The next thing I want to comment
17 on is, as being a retiree, I also have the human
18 resource database for the laboratory retirees. We
19 have more talent in that database than DOE can ever
20 employ.

21 So we've got the manpower solved and we've
22 already did the feasibility. Thank you.

23 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Donald Petersen. And
24 T.K. Thompson will follow Don.

25 MR. PETERSEN: I'm Don Peterson. I am a

1 retired employee of the Los Alamos Laboratory. And I
2 want to thank the DOE and GNEP for the opportunity to
3 speak in support of spent fuel storage.

4 The EIS being considered at these public
5 meetings is an important first step. But there are
6 two indisputable facts in our current situation.

7 First of all fossil fuel reserves are finite
8 and dwindling at an ever increasing rate. As the
9 demand goes up, there are going to be 8 billion people
10 in the world by 2030.

11 Energy will double by 2030 and quadruple by
12 the end of the century, leaving coal as the most
13 important remaining source of fossil energy capable of
14 fulfilling the double and quadruple demand.

15 Of the 8 billion people in the world, by 2030
16 most will be part of an emerging Third World economy
17 with rapidly rising per capita energy consumption.
18 Demand inevitably will rise and competition for
19 remaining supplies of fossil fuels will lead to
20 increased political instability and confrontation.

21 Current events convince us that the urgency
22 of expanding energy availability to avoid
23 confrontation is real. The expansion is probably less
24 expensive than the confrontation. And dealing with
25 the problem is not an option.

1 How do we double or quadruple the world
2 energy availability in less than 100 years. The
3 substitute methods within the current energy framework
4 miss the point completely. We're searching for
5 enormous amounts of energy to avoid confrontation and
6 economic collapse.

7 Transition to new technology will take 50
8 years so we're already 20 years behind and falling
9 further behind because of quibbling over engineering
10 and economic details based entirely on current
11 experience. We must make correct technological
12 choices now that minimize the proliferation jitters
13 and proceed with development as quickly as possible.

14 Nuclear power generation is the only means of
15 providing the amount of energy required without an
16 enormous emission burden. A pound of uranium contains
17 roughly a million times more available energy than a
18 pound of anything else and as a consequence a million
19 times less waste.

20 Advanced reactor designs and closed fuel
21 cycle are a start. That's what we're talking about
22 today. We enthusiastically support the notion of
23 spent fuel storage and reprocessing outlined in the
24 GNEP consideration of the Los Alamos, Hobbs, and
25 Roswell groups and regard the effort as good for the

1 country and especially good for New Mexico.

2 MR. BROWN: Thank you. T.K. Thompson. And
3 Scott Kovac will be next.

4 MR. THOMPSON: Hi, I'm T.K. Thompson, I'm a
5 landscape photographer and a U.S. citizen, I live in
6 White Rock. I would like to start off by applauding
7 DOE for allowing technical sanity to return to the
8 commercial nuclear fuel power cycle.

9 I was involved at the Idaho during the Carter
10 Administration, when he enacted the ban on
11 reprocessing under the guise of ceasing to spread the
12 proliferation of nuclear weapon technology. Well,
13 that didn't work too well. If you look at North Korea
14 and you look at Iran, you look at Pakistan, you look
15 at India. It was just bad policy. I also am real
16 curious about how many terawatts of fissile energy is
17 sitting in spent fuel pools in this country compared
18 to how many terawatts of foreign oil we import yearly.

19 I like this technology, what they're
20 proposing, because it's going to decrease our
21 dependence on foreign oil which I think is absolutely
22 necessary. There are some aspects of this that need
23 to be addressed that I think have very important
24 national impacts.

25 One we just touched on was this foreign oil

1 issue. Oil and hydrocarbon fuels are becoming too
2 valuable to burn for energy. And what I'm talking
3 about here is their value lies in feedstocks to
4 production processes to make pharmaceuticals, to make
5 textiles, to make plastics. It's just too valuable of
6 a commodity to burn up for a Btu.

7 Secondly, the greenhouse gas issue. I am yet
8 to understand how a nuclear power reactor makes carbon
9 dioxide. I don't believe it does. We could at least
10 show face in the world that we are doing something
11 about the greenhouse gas issue instead of looking the
12 other way.

13 I would actually prefer to see this sitting
14 in my backyard and instead of drilling for oil in the
15 Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for a few years for
16 the petroleum or Otero Mesa in Southern New Mexico or
17 the Valle Vidal in Northern New Mexico. It just
18 doesn't make any sense.

19 There are certainly issues involving waste.
20 But yet this country deems acceptable the fact that we
21 kill 40 or 50,000 people on the highways a year. I
22 don't think commercial nuclear power has any kind of a
23 mortality rate compared to what we wipe out on
24 highways in this country, but yet that's acceptable.

25 You people took more risk probably driving

1 from Albuquerque up here than you would if you lived
2 next to a commercial power reactor for 20 years. And
3 I'd like to thank DOE for coming to Los Alamos and
4 thank you for the opportunity to talk.

5 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Scott Kovac and Greg
6 Mello will be next.

7 MR. KOVAC: Thank you. My name is Scott
8 Kovac, I'm with the Nuclear Watch New Mexico. GNEP is
9 being proposed as an environmentally friendlier way
10 for nuclear energy to provide electricity for the
11 United States and the world.

12 So please consider the environmental impacts
13 every step of the way. Please describe all of the
14 reprocessing programs that you are thinking about, you
15 know, involving in this. Please state how long all
16 the research and development studies will take to be
17 realized in your draft EIS.

18 Please state such things as the ratio of the
19 spent fuel expected to the input to the amount of fuel
20 that will be -- you know, please state the ratio of
21 the spent fuel to the amount of waste that will
22 eventually be buried. It was said that Los Alamos is
23 going to produce the first fuel for this program.
24 Please ascribe in detail that process, that program.

25 You know, please explain -- please describe

1 the metric tons of spent fuel rods that are going to
2 come to Los Alamos and the transportation effects. In
3 general just be more specific about the program.

4 If you don't know something or if something
5 is under development or if you're not exactly sure how
6 it's going to turn out, just say it, just be more
7 transparent. This gets right to the concept of
8 calling GNEP recycling, you know, instead of
9 reprocessing. If it is reprocessing, just call it
10 reprocessing, please.

11 Please provide a crosswalk between GNEP
12 now -- I'm sorry. Please provide a crosswalk between
13 GNEP and current programs such as the advanced fuel
14 cycle initiative. Please discuss the safety, the
15 expected safety of the reactors involved. And also
16 please describe the total expected cost of the entire
17 program. Thank you.

18 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Greg Mello. And
19 Paulette Frankl will be next.

20 MR. MELLO: Thank you. My name is Greg
21 Mello, I'm with the Los Alamos study group. I can
22 identify seven goals for this project. And, since
23 this is a scoping hearing, I think we should look at
24 alternative federal means to meet those goals.

25 The goals I am hearing and seeing are

1 provision of energy, protection of climate, prevention
2 of proliferation, and -- excuse me, I have six here.
3 And then there are three others that I think aren't as
4 explicit. And I want to name them.

5 Global gemini, enormous profits for
6 privileged corporations, and avoidance of social and
7 political change as we deal with the problems of
8 energy, climate, and proliferation.

9 I am always amazed that collectively we can
10 turn bad problems into real catastrophes. Given that
11 the GNEP program misses the entire target so far, it's
12 difficult to speak to the specific types of
13 environmental analysis that should be made.

14 But clearly alternatives which meet those
15 first three goals of energy, of providing a stable
16 energy supply, protecting the climate, and preventing
17 proliferation, there are plenty of alternatives. They
18 are very practical.

19 They start with conservation. And I agree
20 that they -- some of them don't look very practical
21 right now. But that is part I think of the character
22 of the situation we find ourselves in.

23 I believe that none of the technical claims
24 made by Dr. Spurgeon are actually true. And I would
25 be happy to help arrange a debate on those points here

1 in Los Alamos regarding the technical merit of this
2 program, the economic merit, and environmental merit,
3 and on nuclear power generally.

4 And I think it's important not to lump the
5 two together because upon information and belief I
6 don't believe that the commercial nuclear power
7 industry in the United States is at all supportive of
8 the GNEP project.

9 I want to speak quickly to the diplomatic
10 aspect here, the goal that was claimed. I think that
11 the diplomatic and corporate goal to create nuclear
12 vassal states by controlling the nuclear fuel market
13 with controlling interest held by the same small
14 groups of wealthy nuclear weapon states that are the P
15 five, permanent five members of the security council
16 will definitely not work. No country that seeks
17 energy independence or sovereignty will turn over that
18 sovereignty to a fuel suppliers group.

19 I think that overall GNEP appears to be based
20 on fiscal unrealities, unreal fiscal assumptions, on
21 unreal economic assumptions, on these unreal
22 diplomatic assumptions, unreal environmental
23 assumptions, fantasies about security, unreal
24 assumptions about management and safety, unreal
25 assumptions about the time scale involved relative to

1 the problems that are to be solved, unreal assumptions
2 about capital availability, unreal assumptions about
3 accountability and governance of the project, unreal
4 assumptions about liability, unreal assumptions about
5 the kind of society that this scale of investment in
6 this type of technology will create and the stability
7 of those technologies in that society.

8 Because this isn't just a plan for energy, it
9 isn't just a plan for climate, it's really a plan for
10 the entire society at the scale that's being talked
11 about here.

12 I think that, as has been alluded to by Scott
13 and Clea and I think possibly maybe Alva too, the
14 waste increases in the reprocessing process, not
15 decreases. Of course, the form changes.

16 But what happens is that a lot of the wastes
17 that are created move off the table and they're no
18 longer the responsibility of the nuclear team. It's
19 assumed that some of the tails of the process will
20 become unregulated waste and can be put in ordinary
21 landfills; for example, the uranium which will be the
22 final outcome of the transmutation process talked
23 about.

24 I just want to thank everybody here and who
25 has spoken in favor of this plan and suggest that we

1 are all on the same side here working on really hard
2 problems that are not solvable within the paradigm
3 that has produced the GNEP proposal.

4 We have serious proliferation problems and we
5 need the expertise of people who understand this. But
6 I hope personally that this expertise is not applied
7 in the GNEP program. Thank you.

8 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Paulette Frankl.

9 MS. FRANKL: My name is Paulette Frankl. I
10 live in Santa Fe. And I'm here on behalf of the
11 common sense. That's just my own common sense, no
12 organization.

13 A number of points have been addressed this
14 evening. And one of the things that becomes
15 incredibly clear to me, if there is fantasy or fairy
16 tail versus fact. The fairy tale is that a very
17 beautiful or very tight presentation was made in which
18 everything sounds good and looks good and appears to
19 be forward moving regardless of this meeting. And
20 thank you for giving us the opportunity to have this
21 meeting.

22 The fact is we live in high desert. Los
23 Alamos is in the high desert in a very fragile
24 ecosystem. We have a water shortage. With the
25 exception of this year, there has been the most severe

1 drought of 150 years.

2 And now we're in this global warming thing.
3 And we don't know what the weather is going to be. We
4 don't have much water here. How dare any situation
5 even be suggested that is going to use huge amounts of
6 water. And then where -- and then there's the liquid
7 waste problem.

8 I happen to buy my food at the farmer's
9 market. Where do these farmers grow the food? Many
10 of them grow their food in the canyons of -- below Los
11 Alamos. Now, Los Alamos is not exactly -- hasn't
12 exactly been a stellar -- I don't know what example of
13 using waste in a very good way.

14 It is a fact that the waste does go into the
15 water table. And it certainly affects the pueblos
16 which I think a lot of people don't care about. And
17 it affects the more wealthy people in, say, Santa Fe.

18 But what is Santa Fe compared to what,
19 Washington D.C., New York, Los Angeles, the bigger
20 metropolis. I say, if it's all that safe, build it
21 there, put it in Crawford, put it in Washington, D.C.
22 This is not a safe thing to do. There hasn't been
23 enough research, there hasn't been enough anything
24 done for it.

25 We don't know. And there's the

1 transportation factor. I know that 599 was built to
2 transport nuclear waste. Every time I take any long
3 drive, I see horrendous accidents with big vehicles.
4 Now, you don't need a war to be in a war zone, all you
5 need is an accident. And there are many forms of
6 accidents.

7 Is there really any safe form of nuclear
8 containing situation? No, there isn't.

9 Then there is wind. We live in a very windy
10 area. Wind will blow the nuclear situation, the
11 radioactive situation for a very long ways. And then
12 it settles on everything.

13 So we have air, water, wind, the earth, which
14 is seepage into the earth, then there's jobs. And
15 jobs and money, of course, is what America is all
16 about.

17 So I say take the intelligence that is
18 gathered here in Los Alamos, some of the greatest
19 minds at planet are here, and instead of using it for
20 this nuclear thing which really is just meant to give
21 us greater power throughout the world with these
22 corporate monopolies, I mean face it, we're not really
23 all that deceived by what's going on.

24 And make us stewards of the Earth, make us
25 stewards of a better life, make New Mexico an example

1 of what can be done to better the situation in an
2 organic way rather than in something for which up
3 until this moment it really hasn't worked. Thank you.

4 MR. BROWN: Sheri Kotowski.

5 MS. KOTOWSKI: My name is Sheri Kotowski.
6 And I live in the Embudo Valley of Northern New
7 Mexico. It's kind of a typical rural Northern New
8 Mexico community that's comprised of several cultures,
9 Pueblo cultures, Hispanic cultures using traditional
10 irrigation systems. A lot of people grow their own
11 food. A lot of people grow food for the surrounding
12 communities in New Mexico.

13 This is the fourth opportunity I've had in
14 the last eight months to personally address the
15 Department of Energy regarding expanding nuclear
16 industry operations in New Mexico. And I consider all
17 of the proposals that the DOE has made in the last
18 eight months to be just about expanding nuclear
19 operations.

20 Hundreds of people have spoken in opposition
21 to these expanding nuclear operations. And hundreds
22 of people couldn't make it here tonight because people
23 have families they have to feed, they have jobs, they
24 can't come out in the evening. So, although they
25 haven't said I can represent them, I feel like I

1 represent them in opposing another DOE plan to further
2 contaminate our planet on the whole.

3 I'd like to repeat -- I'm not going to repeat
4 everything that Clea said or Scott said or Alva said
5 or Greg said. One thing I will reiterate that Greg
6 said which I think is really important, and this is
7 about social change. And all of this science that was
8 produced in the past is not going to solve any of the
9 problems that we've created with energy dependence.

10 I'm also going to say that the nuclear
11 industry has been working really hard for 64 years
12 producing massive quantities of radioactive and toxic
13 waste and then turning their back and walking away.
14 GNEP is not going to solve that, the problem of the
15 waste that has been produced by 64 years of nuclear
16 industry activities.

17 That's the real issue. I think that that
18 should be first on the list, solving how to clean up
19 technologies to really get rid of the waste, not to
20 produce more waste.

21 I'd like to know very specifically, one of
22 the things about this reprocessing is -- and one of
23 the things in the GNEP is that, when you -- if you buy
24 into this program, then you're entitled to send your
25 fuel rods back for reprocessing.

1 So you've reprocessed it, you've sent it out.
2 And then all of these spent rods come back again. But
3 in any of these processes you can't reprocess
4 processed material. So how are you going to deal with
5 that?

6 We would like to know the impacts, the
7 cumulative impacts of all the facilities that are at
8 Los Alamos right now and how, if you expand the
9 operations at the CMR and pit production and so you
10 have increased waste there and then you'll have the
11 increased waste from the reprocessing, what are you
12 going to do with that?

13 And then you have the waste that's going to
14 be generated by the complex 2030 prospect. So we have
15 a whole bunch of stuff that the lab already has on its
16 plate, that the nuclear industry already has on its
17 plate that they haven't begun to deal with.

18 The last thing I want to say is first we need
19 realistic human health assessments of the cumulative
20 impacts incorporated into all of this. And so then
21 the last thing I want to say is that I don't think
22 that there's any place in heaven or on Earth that
23 should carry the disrespect associated with the burden
24 of the nuclear industry. Thank you.

25 MR. BROWN: Thank you. All your statements

1 are very precise and very succinct. And, in fact,
2 that concludes of number --

3 MS. MONTANO: I want to talk.

4 MR. BROWN: Well, let me just say, that
5 concludes the folks who actually had signed up to
6 speak. So at this point I would like to ask if
7 there's anyone else in the audience who would like to
8 speak.

9 And if I could get a show of hands just to
10 get an idea of how many other folks. I know we have
11 one here in front. Also, if folks who have spoken and
12 have kept to the time limit and you would like to
13 augment your statement after everyone else has had a
14 first chance to speak, you're welcome to do that as
15 well.

16 Okay. Our next speaker. Again if you can
17 identify yourself and offer an organization
18 affiliation, if appropriate.

19 MS. MONTANO: My name is Catherine Montano, I
20 live in Las Vegas, New Mexico. I'm downwind from Los
21 Alamos labs. Los Alamos should be closed down, it is
22 outright criminal what they continue to do to the
23 human race and all life on the planet.

24 When Los Alamos had that fire, one-third of
25 Los Alamos burnt down. How many deadly chemicals were

1 in the air? Our trees in Las Vegas are dying. Our
2 cats and dogs have diabetes, cancer, our people.
3 Diabetes is linked to radiation exposure.

4 And for you to come here and say that nuclear
5 is safe, sorry, it isn't. It's outright criminal.
6 All atomic activity must cease upon the Earth. There
7 is no safe way of storing it or disposing of it. And
8 nuclear facilities are making too much of it.

9 This is the greatest crime to humanity and
10 all life on the planet and the universe and you say
11 that it's safe. I want to point out our state right
12 here. Would somebody help me give out these maps so
13 all these people from Los Alamos can see how they have
14 contaminated our state. Would somebody help me give
15 them out.

16 Not only are we dealing with nuclear
17 plutonium and all the crap chemicals that you use up
18 here at Los Alamos, but being that New Mexico has
19 uranium mines, 40 percent of all the uranium that has
20 come out of these mines is here in our state.

21 I want to show you this map. We are in the
22 nuclear holocaust. To continue this is going to be
23 the end of the human race as we know it. I have been
24 to the legislature talking to my senators and my
25 representatives. And I have told them they have taken

1 an oath to the Constitutions of the United States.

2 And, if they do not stand up for the people,
3 we will unseat them as elected officials or appointed
4 officials and put them in jail, because it is outright
5 criminal to continue something that is destroying all
6 of us.

7 I have talked to uranium miners who are dying
8 and don't get no medical help. I have talked to
9 soldiers where we have dropped the uranium 238 bomb in
10 the Middle East. We have destroyed the Middle East.

11 And, you know, for us to say that we are the
12 superpower of the world, well, we've been super stupid
13 when it has come to burying or destroying or disposing
14 of nuclear waste. And you all think that because we
15 have a salt mine that's leaking that it's a safe place
16 to store nuclear waste. Karst terrain is the most
17 dangerous terrain to store nuclear waste. And the
18 Department of Energy has gone against science.

19 If you've been to Carlsbad Caverns, those
20 caverns go up New Mexico into Canada and down into
21 Mexico. And what's going to happen with those million
22 drums that you're going to be storing at WIPP? The
23 salt water is going to open up those drums and the
24 gases are going to go up and down those caves. And
25 wherever these caves have openings in the earth, it's

1 going to filter for eternity.

2 And, because of the pressures of the earth,
3 it's not going to dissipate into outer space. And
4 we're going to have fallout all the time,
5 radioactivity fallout. And every time we drop a bomb
6 we're having radioactivity fallout for 50 or more
7 years. We live on one planet. We don't live on Mars,
8 we live on Earth. And we have destroyed the Earth.
9 And for you to continue this nuclear madness is
10 outright criminal.

11 You cannot control it and you continue to
12 tell the people that you can. Here in New Mexico we
13 have the largest radioactive spill in the United
14 States. No cleanup. The tailings from the uranium
15 mines, they're blowing in the wind. No cleanup.

16 The Rio Grande, our biggest river in the
17 State of New Mexico, is radioactive. Cochiti Lake,
18 plutonium all over the place. Our fish, our food.
19 It's in our bodies. It used to be one out of 20
20 people got cancer.

21 Look to your left, look to your right. Out
22 of the three of you, two of you will have cancer.
23 And, believe me, it is a painful way to die. My
24 father died of cancer, my mother died of cancer, my
25 sister died of diabetes, my brother died of cancer.

1 How many more of us have to die before you
2 scientists open up your minds to what you are doing to
3 the human race. Like God says, if you live by the
4 sword, you will die by the sword. If we live by
5 nuclear weapons, we're going to die by nuclear
6 weapons.

7 I have sat in hearings for 17 years listening
8 to people from throughout the United States and
9 throughout the world that live by nuclear facilities
10 that have died painful deaths, people that work in
11 nuclear facilities, painful deaths.

12 This is outright criminal to continue
13 something that we cannot control. And it is better to
14 be active today than radioactive tomorrow and it is
15 time to stop this nuclear madness. We live in the
16 sunbelt 80 percent of the time the sun shines in the
17 Southwest.

18 We have a lot of wind. And you know what you
19 have done to this state. You think you're going to
20 get away with it. You know what, I've had a death
21 experience and I have crossed over. And I never
22 volunteered to do this work.

23 God threw me out of my bed and told me to
24 stop the nuclear madness. And I am fed up in sitting
25 in nuclear hearings and hearing people cry and please,

1 please don't do this to us.

2 So you've got to stop this criminal act
3 because God will stop it. And all of you that
4 continue this, you wait. When you die, you're not
5 going to be dead. You're going to be in hell for what
6 you have done to us.

7 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

8 Let me ask again, are there any other folks
9 who haven't spoken yet who would like to make a
10 comment? And again I compliment everybody for staying
11 on schedule.

12 Is there anybody who felt they wanted to add
13 to their previous statement? We are scheduled to stay
14 in session. And, when nobody is ready to speak, we
15 will stand in recess. If somebody decides they have
16 something to add, please see me and we will reconvene.
17 And I appreciate your attendance here your very
18 helpful comments. Thanks.

19 (Comments)

20 MS. MONTANO: Our planet already has a degree
21 of fever caused by radioactivity, not greenhouse
22 effect nor missing ozone. That one degree has already
23 upset the earth's metabolism enough to cause many
24 fishes in the sea to migrate into polar waters.

25 It is causing ice caps and glaciers to melt.

1 Actually the degree registers a bit more above one
2 degree and rising. Less than ten more degrees of
3 radioactivity fever will make our planet a barren
4 waste.

5 Murder through atomic suicide. I want to
6 talk about the contamination in our state. The
7 Socorro area depleted uranium, weapon range
8 contaminated large areas of our water and land.

9 Down as WIPP is karst terrain. According to
10 science karst terrain is the most dangerous terrain to
11 store nuclear waste. The Department of Energy has
12 lied to the people of the United States.

13 What will happen in the future when the salt
14 mines that are not dry, another lie from the
15 Department of Energy, the metal drums, the salt water
16 is going to open them up. And the first thing that's
17 going to escape from these drums are the gases. And
18 these gases are going to be up and down this karst
19 terrain. And wherever the caves have openings in the
20 earth it's going to filter for eternity.

21 And, because of the pressures that we have
22 around our globe, it is not going to dissipate into
23 outer space. So we will have radiation fallout for
24 eternity. And this is what they are doing to the
25 human race. And it must stop, it is outright

1 criminal. Here in New Mexico Los Alamos Lab has
2 grossly contaminated the Rio Grande.

3 People in our state drink water from the Rio
4 Grande. Cochiti Lake, they have found plutonium in
5 the soil. In Rio Puerco in 1979, near Church Rock, we
6 have the largest radioactive spill in the United
7 States. No cleanup.

8 The uranium mines in Grants, Laguna, Gallup,
9 and Acoma, the radioactivity blows in the winds. No
10 cleanup. Our rivers are radioactive. The Rio Puerco,
11 the Rio San Jose, the Rio Paguata, the Rio Moquino,
12 the Rio Grande, all way down to Elephant Butte have
13 high concentrations of uranium contaminated silt in
14 the Paguata Reservoir.

15 The first atomic bomb was exploded here in
16 New Mexico in White Sands. Many adobe homes here in
17 New Mexico are radioactive. In Albuquerque there is
18 plutonium in the soils of the university of
19 Albuquerque, the zoo, several parks, and the schools.

20 The DOE has dumped radioactivity into the
21 sewer systems of Albuquerque. They have 26 sites on
22 the premises of Kirtland and Sandia. No cleanup.

23 There's fuel rods in those locations. No
24 cleanup. By WIPP we have one of the largest dairy
25 farms in the United States. The Gnome project in

1 1961, an underground nuclear bomb test in which large
2 radioactive plumes escaped into the air.

3 Another thing. I've been trying for 17 years
4 to get nuclear radiation monitoring devices for Las
5 Vegas. And to this day we have not gotten nothing.

6 The Los Alamos fire put out tons and tons of
7 radiation. And it was not monitored. And yet our
8 people are dying, the deformity in the children.

9 All the nuclear facilities around the country
10 are obsolete. Hanford in the early nineties, I heard
11 a presentation that it could be the next Chernobyl.
12 Just the other day, I heard that Palo Verde could also
13 be another Chernobyl.

14 So what we need to do is we need to stop
15 making this nuclear technology that we cannot control.
16 We need to start worrying about the nuclear facilities
17 that exist and how we're going to be able to control
18 what is coming out of them, which I know that we
19 can't. We can't even pull radioactivity out of the
20 water and we're all drinking it.

21 It's in the food chain, it's in our bodies.
22 We're all walking time bombs. And the reason they get
23 away with it is it takes many years to destroy your
24 body. But, at the end of your life, you end up with
25 diabetes or cancer, neurological disease, heart

1 disease, kidney disease.

2 And it is outright criminal to continue
3 something that we cannot control. We can forgive them
4 at the beginning of this technology because they did
5 not know what they were working with. But I have
6 heard many experts, and one is Dr. Ernest Sternglass.
7 He has been a researcher all his life. He's 83 years
8 old now. And his findings came out that low level
9 radiation is just as bad as any other level of
10 radiation.

11 So for anybody to stand up here in these
12 nuclear hearings and to continue to lie and say that
13 it's safe and that they can contain it, it is running
14 rampant in our groundwater, in our surface water.

15 They have thrown nuclear waste into our
16 oceans. Our oceans are full of it. The fish don't
17 know what to do with it anymore. That's why a lot of
18 these fish are coming to beach themselves, because the
19 oceans are so polluted. They have stored it in the
20 mountains.

21 They say that the DOE stands for the
22 Department of Energy. The 17 years I've been
23 involved, I see them as the devils of the earth. I am
24 fed up with what they continue to do with the human
25 race.

1 And, as far as the nuclear bombs, we have
2 enough bombs to melt the earth thousands of times
3 over. It does no good to drop a nuclear bomb on the
4 enemy and then send in our own fighting troops and we
5 end up contaminating all these young men and women
6 that are in the child bearing years.

7 And then they come back and they have little
8 monsters. We are having children that are being born
9 without brains, without arms, without legs, with their
10 hearts out of their bodies. This madness must stop.
11 Forty percent of all uranium has come out of New
12 Mexico. Actually it's several states.

13 I continue to do this work because somebody
14 needs to fight for the children and the future
15 generations. I fight for the sick people. When my
16 brother was alive, he was my older brother, he told
17 me, Cathy, don't talk doomsday.

18 He says, oh, a bomb should drop on me and
19 kill us all. And, when he said that, I felt like I
20 had been hit with a bullet. I said, Mikey, don't say
21 that.

22 Well, the bomb did drop on him, he got
23 cancer, he turned into a total skeleton. My mother
24 turned into a total skeleton. My sister that died of
25 diabetes, she grew like a monster before she died.

1 I've seen so many children that are deformed, so much
2 sickness. People are suffering. This is a very
3 painful way to die.

4 And all these uranium mines that are in Utah,
5 Wyoming, Colorado, and New Mexico, waters flow down.
6 And we're at the bottom of these states. And the
7 radon is in our water because of the uranium is very
8 high.

9 It should be under 200 picocuries per liter.
10 In Las Vegas it's at 1,056 picocuries per liter. In
11 Tucumcari it's 181, in Clovis it's 646, in Ruidoso
12 it's 743, Las Cruces 801, in Carlsbad 175, Silver City
13 773, Grants 596, Farmington 323. So naturally we
14 drink poison water and they continue to poison us.

15 And you know that I'm not scared to die
16 because I have died and I have crossed over to
17 paradise. It is a beautiful place. There's flowers,
18 so many flowers. Everything is so green and
19 beautiful, the water runs crystal clear, the children
20 play freely. And, as I was there, I just looked at
21 all this beauty and I was so jubilant and so at peace.

22 And, as I was standing there just looking at
23 all this beauty, thousands of people started to come
24 to greet me. And, as I looked at the front rows, they
25 were all my dead relatives. And, when I looked at my

1 grandmother, she was like from here to that wall over
2 there.

3 And, when we did eye contact and smiled at
4 each other, in a snap of a fingers everything
5 disappeared. It's like everything you see in here and
6 everything you see outside, all of a sudden it's all
7 light.

8 And then a deep voice talked to me, a very
9 strong voice, and asked me if I wanted to stay. And I
10 said no, I need to go back, my children are too
11 little. And the voice said that I had to change my
12 life or I would die like Marilyn Monroe. And at the
13 time the information I knew about Marilyn is she
14 committed suicide. And I know that I will never
15 commit suicide no matter how hard my life gets.

16 Then a few years later it come out in the
17 news that the Mafia killed her. And I realized what
18 it meant. Anyway, after I told the Lord, no, I want
19 to go back, in a snap of a fingers, I was back up in
20 my room, looking at my physical body in the bed.

21 There was a laser light coming from the
22 heavens into my room and it was going up and down my
23 body from head to toe. Then I entered my body and I
24 felt the warmth of the light. After that -- I could
25 tell you about spaceships.

1 You know, at the end of time, I don't know if
2 you know about the War of Armageddon. Armageddon will
3 not be a war between humans, it will be between the
4 good and the bad aliens. The bad aliens use plutonium
5 for their ships. Down at WIPP they have the greys.

6 I know people that work down there and have
7 come to me and have told me that what I have said
8 throughout the years is very true. See, I received a
9 message at one of the WIPP hearings from the Ashtar
10 Command. And our government knows about the Ashtar
11 Command.

12 And in that message it said opposition to
13 WIPP, say no to the Waste Isolation Project, WIPP.
14 The massive hole dug in mother earth and into the salt
15 of her veins is meant to house nuclear waste and
16 dispose of them. It is a lie. There are entities
17 from the dark forces at work here. Skullduggery
18 abounds.

19 Chemical warfare has become state of the art.
20 Thanks to the dark forces that have spread out world
21 disease, one which is AIDS, there are bunkers
22 throughout the country that are now contaminated which
23 is all our nuclear facilities. The canisters have
24 leaked and are earmarked to come to WIPP.

25 How dare they. This will devastate our

1 state. A secret underground base is planned by the
2 dark forces to complete the H bomb. The very fabric
3 of creation is in danger. Our schoolyards. This is a
4 most crucial time.

5 Your brothers and sisters of space send our
6 love, joy, and hope and peace to our brothers and
7 sisters of earth. Know that we are in the skies for
8 you and we send a hand of friendship and we stand with
9 you. Come forth, light workers, come forth. I am
10 Ashtar and I have spoken through a starfighter,
11 through those gentle warriors and warriors of the sky
12 and so it shall be.

13 And there are millions and millions of ships
14 that are watching the earth. And, if it comes to the
15 point where mankind starts a big nuclear war, God is
16 going to intervene. And that's when we will see a lot
17 of things happening. And I never asked to do this
18 work, I was physically thrown out of my bed to do this
19 work and I am very tired. And I'm very sad of what's
20 happening to all of us.

21 I just want to say that here we're the super
22 power and yet we should be talking peace. And it
23 seems as, since the Bushes went in, it's been nothing
24 but war and death and sorrow and stress and
25 oppression. And like I say I'm not scared to die

1 because it's my ticket to paradise. I have seen it.

2 And all these men and women that continue to
3 push nuclear on the world, knowing the dangers,
4 knowing that they cannot control it, like God says I
5 will ruin those ruining the earth.

6 And these people that think that, after they
7 die, that that's the end of their life, it isn't.
8 They will either go to paradise or they'll go to hell.
9 And in hell they will live to eternity. So it is time
10 that they start seeing that it is wrong to continue
11 this criminal act.

12 Like I said we could forgive them when they
13 did not know about it. But now they know and we know
14 and it's outright criminal to continue.

15 Another thing that has come to my attention
16 is that the WIPP trucks are carrying drugs. They take
17 the nuclear waste down to WIPP and they're moving
18 drugs on those WIPP trucks. We need an investigation.

19 You know that we were bombarded I think, I
20 get these years wrong, it's either 1914 or 1916. And
21 the government of the world could not stop these
22 invaders. So what the governments of the world did
23 was make a treaty with them to give us much
24 technology, medicine, communication, and travel.

25 And in turn the governments of the world were

1 never to reveal the presence of UFOs on earth, the
2 aliens. And they have been working with them, the
3 dark. They need plutonium for their ships. The
4 reason they're in the drugs is because they need to
5 finance these underground bases.

6 The whole operation is evil. And God is
7 going to put a stop to it all. And like I say I'm not
8 scared because I am tired and I am ready to leave this
9 earth. I think that's it.

10 You know, when I first started going to the
11 nuclear hearings in Albuquerque, I was there from nine
12 in the morning until nine at night for seven days.
13 And I thought where are the TV stations, where are the
14 reporters. This is the most important issue facing
15 the people of this state. And the people don't know
16 the magnitude of this project, they don't know the
17 dangers.

18 So I went to one of the TV stations. And I
19 asked the guy why aren't you covering these hearings.
20 And he said because we didn't know about them. And he
21 says, well, come in here and talk to the reporter. So
22 I went in. The reporter was busy writing. So I sat
23 quietly.

24 And finally, when he looked up at me -- and I
25 liked to look at people straight in the eyes when I

1 speak to them -- his eyes spun like a slot machine.
2 And he jumped off his chair and he told me, ma'am, I
3 have an appointment with the FBI. And he ran out of
4 the building. So we've got aliens walking among us
5 that look human but are not human.

6 And I can only say that the Department of
7 Energy and the Department of Defense, what they have
8 done to the human race, they think they're going to
9 get away with it, but they're not.

10 Eisenhower was a military man all his life,
11 Dwight Eisenhower. If anybody knew the military, it
12 was him. And, when he became our President, in his
13 last speech to the American people, he said beware of
14 the military industrial complex, they will get mighty
15 and powerful. And, in the 17 years that I've been
16 involved, I have seen that, yes, they are powerful.
17 But they're not as powerful as God is.

18 And for them to continue this ugliness, they
19 themselves are being affected by this nuclear
20 radiation exposure. And I feel for them because, when
21 they die they're not going to die, they will rot in
22 hell and burn in hell for eternity, because they're
23 not going to die in hell.

24 So I can only say to our President and to all
25 these people that continue this vicious circle in

1 contaminating our young men and women in these wars
2 that they make up, they are going to pay because God
3 says it, that vengeance is mine. And they will pay
4 for what they are done to all of us. I think that's
5 about all.

6 After my death experience, I was out by the
7 lake in Las Vegas, it's called Storrie Lake. I was
8 with a girlfriend. And it was just getting dark. And
9 she spotted it first and she says, Catherine, look.
10 And we looked up and there was a spaceship.

11 It was hovering and it was rotating. And, as
12 it was rotating, it was showing different colors of
13 lights. And then it stopped the rotation and turned
14 the lights off. And it put a beam to the heavens.
15 It was putting out different colors of lights like
16 this, stationary in the sky.

17 Then it turned the lights off, it stopped the
18 rotation, and it put out a laser beam to the sky.
19 And, as this ship started to ascend, the laser beam
20 got shorter and shorter and shorter and it turned into
21 a beautiful star like Venus. This was 1978.

22 A year later, 1979, my girlfriend and I went
23 out to the lake and she was going out with a guy out
24 of Santa Fe. And we were facing Hermit's Peak.
25 Looking at Hermit's Peak and beyond Hermit's Peak,

1 when my girlfriend told me it's been a long time, we
2 haven't come out to the lake, and I told her since we
3 saw that ship.

4 And just then the guy that was with us said
5 I've been on a ship. And Jesus greeted me as I
6 entered the ship. We were getting ready to laugh at
7 the guy. And the sky lit up with seven ships and in
8 this formation, one, two, three, four, five, six,
9 seven.

10 If you would draw a line to the formation,
11 you would be drawing an oval line. As these ships
12 appeared, we had to put our hands to our ears because
13 there was a high, high pitch coming from these ships.
14 If you've ever done a crystal ball, it has that high
15 pitch. Well, intensify that many times over and
16 that's the sound that was coming from these ships.

17 I told the guy, are they in tune to our
18 conversation. And he said yes. And just then the top
19 ship started coming toward my truck. And I thought
20 oh, my God, they're coming for us. When it was
21 halfway, the man said I told them we weren't ready to
22 go yet.

23 The moment he made the statement, the ship
24 made a U turn and went back to the formation. When it
25 got back to the formation, it turned into this pink

1 orange cloud, kind of like when you see the sun rising
2 or the sun setting. The guy turned around. He said
3 do you believe me now?

4 What's interesting, in the Ashtar message
5 that I shared with you earlier in my testimony, at the
6 bottom where the Star of David was, his name was right
7 inside and it was A-s-h-t-a-r. And around it it had
8 seven dots.

9 And through these hearings I kept thinking,
10 you know, there was three to 400 people, why would it
11 give me this message, it must mean something to me.
12 If I would go to the bathroom, I would ask my
13 girlfriends watch my stuff so I know nobody bothered
14 my stuff.

15 When I picked up this message again, I
16 noticed that somebody had gone over the opposition to
17 WIPP. And it looks like chalk. But, if you touch it,
18 it's not chalk, it's more like a magic marker. And
19 then the star was colored white.

20 And then each little dot was -- they made it
21 look like a spaceship. And that's when I realized oh,
22 my God, that's the way I saw the spaceships line up
23 back in '79. In May of '90 is when I was physically
24 thrown out of my bed to do this work.

25 And I never realized it was going to be as

1 stressful as it has been. At the beginning I could
2 not even say the word plutonium. I used to tell the
3 Anglo women how do you say that word. I could hear it
4 in my brain, but it wouldn't come out of my mouth.

5 And like I say, you know, we have a nuclear
6 holocaust here in the United States and around the
7 world. And, if we do not stop this, there is no --
8 there's no life for none of us.

9 Another thing about WIPP. Being that there's
10 salt water, when these drums open up, the
11 radioactivity is going to flow to the waters of
12 Mexico, to their groundwater. And this is outright
13 criminal for us to be doing this to an innocent
14 country that does not even have nuclear power plants
15 or any kind of nuclear activity in Mexico. If they
16 have anything there now, it's because we have dumped
17 it there.

18 And I believe they have chosen New Mexico to
19 be the dump for the nation because the rest of the
20 nation thinks that New Mexico is Mexico and that we're
21 just a bunch of Mexicans and we live out in the
22 desert. But we're just as human as anybody around the
23 United States. And God says he will take care of it,
24 vengeance is his and he will take care of what is
25 happening. And the way I see it the time is short.

1 After the Los Alamos fire, it's interesting
2 because it was like a chain reaction, fires around the
3 country near nuclear facilities. So I don't know if
4 the Department of Energy and these guys that are
5 working with all this nuclear were trying to burn the
6 evidence, because it's too coincidental, you know, to
7 have all these fires near these nuclear facilities.

8 I know a lot of people that have worked at
9 Los Alamos that work with plutonium pits and cores
10 that have told me that they don't care, they don't
11 care what they do.

12 When we talk to the Secretary of the
13 Environment, Pete Majori, when we told him that we
14 wanted cleanup at Los Alamos, and I saw an article in
15 the journal where it said that, in the history of Los
16 Alamos, never have they gotten that kind of a cleanup
17 order.

18 And, when Majori went to Washington to
19 Congressional hearings, they scolded him and told him
20 that who the hell did he think he was by giving this
21 kind of an order to Los Alamos Labs. And he told them
22 that there was a constitutional group in New Mexico
23 that were ready to put him in jail because of the
24 contamination to the land and to the people.

25 And in Washington they told him we don't give

1 a damn about the people in New Mexico, you do what we
2 tell you. So Pete Majori resigned because he did not
3 want no part of what was going on.

4 New Mexico needs a Superfund because we are
5 grossly contaminated in our state. So I hope that
6 whoever reads this testimony, that they take into
7 consideration that it's time to give us a Superfund.

8 It's time to give us free medical because
9 they have destroyed the health of the people of this
10 state. I feel that New Mexicans should pay taxes,
11 property taxes. And, at one time when this whole
12 nuclear industry started, they talked about relocating
13 the people in New Mexico. I think it's time to
14 relocate us, because it is not right that we are
15 drinking radioactive water.

16 The more the human race gets radiated and the
17 animals, the more violent they're going to become.
18 And in the future is going to be uncontrollable,
19 what's happening on the earth.

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, JAN A. WILLIAMS, New Mexico CCR #14, DO
HEREBY CERTIFY that on March 1, 2007, the proceedings
were taken before me, that I did report in
stenographic shorthand the proceedings set forth
herein, and the foregoing pages are a true and correct
transcription to the best of my ability.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither employed
by nor related to nor contracted with (unless excepted
by the rules) any of the parties or attorneys in this
case, and that I have no interest whatsoever in the
final disposition of this case in any court.

JAN A. WILLIAMS, RPR
New Mexico CCR #14
License Expires: 12/31/07

(3624B) JAW