

Untitled

1 FRANK PERNA: ***** , Las
2 Vegas, 89103. Ever since President Bush's
3 recommendation of Yucca Mountain, Nevada and Nevadans
4 have been treated with disrespect and deceit. He,
5 meaning the President, broke two campaign promises.
6 In 2000, sound science would determine eligibility of
7 Yucca Mountain. In 2004 the courts would decide
8 after the court's overturned the EPA 10,000 year
9 standard.

10 There were then three outstanding scandals.
11 The U.S. Geological Survey e-mails that admitted the
12 files were fudged, two sets of books were kept, and
13 doubt was expressed about scientific integrity of
14 files.

15 Then Kristi Hodges, auditor, DOE auditor,
16 filed a complaint with the Department of Energy
17 Inspector General which included examples of two
18 other employees being replaced after data deficiency
19 complaints. These complaints remained uninvestigated
20 for over four years, along with a FOIA request from
21 the Las Vegas Review-Journal and only were released
22 when Kristi Hodges resigned.

23 The Las Vegas Review-Journal received
24 heavily redacted files out of chronological order on
25 purpose.

3

1 The most deceitful act was this sentence in
2 the DOE 2007 budget request. The Yucca Mountain

Untitled

3 project is critical to national and homeland security
4 and for the future of the nation's electrical energy
5 supply, as well as for nuclear non-proliferation and
6 protecting our environment.

7 A statement was made by an IAEA
8 representative that outlined the proliferation of
9 civilian nuclear reactors would lead to the
10 proliferation of nuclear weapons technology. This is
11 proven by North Korea and Iran who gained nuclear
12 weapons expertise through civilian use of nuclear
13 energy. This is only common sense given that the
14 Bush administration is promoting GNEP, Global Nuclear
15 Energy Partnership, in which the United States would
16 build civilian reactors worldwide and then transport
17 the nuclear waste here to be reprocessed, therefore
18 Yucca Mountain has nothing to do with proliferation
19 of weapons technology.

20 This is a stretch to say that Yucca Mountain
21 has something to do with proliferation. It wouldn't
22 have anything to do with proliferation if they didn't
23 promote GNEP and didn't have atoms for peace, which
24 eventually, you know, people learn. I have to
25 explain it. People learn by having reactors,

4

1 civilian reactors, and therefore they pick up weapons
2 technology.

3 Transporting nuclear waste countrywide,
4 exposing millions of citizens to risk of accident and
5 terrorism during wartime is risky, illogical, and may

Untitled

6 harm the environment, whereby leaving it in dry cask
7 storage, as some scientists advocate, is
8 environmentally sound. Other statements are
9 inaccurate, overblown and just deceitful. I'm
10 talking there about the 2007 Department of Energy
11 budget request statement.

12 There are valid scientific reasons this
13 project should be abandoned, but the Bush
14 administration has politicized, with the compliance
15 of Congress, the project and is continuing with an
16 expansion of 147,000 acres and increasing the
17 capacity to infinity from 77,000 metric tons while
18 planning for a \$100,000 upgrade of the facilities.
19 The upgrade is mainly to provide roads ridged enough
20 to transport nuclear waste.

21 Where is the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
22 oversight?

23 Please answer the complaints and scientific
24 questions in this letter to me and on the public
25 record. All Americans deserve open and honest

5

1 government. Future generations deserve a safe and
2 secure environment. Two copies are included relating
3 to GNEP and the 2007 DOE budget request.

4 I outlined one sentence there. I'm sure you
5 read the sentence. It's a beauty. It is a beauty.
6 This other is a detailed explanation of GNEP, which
7 President Bush never had the courtesy to tell the
8 American people. If you ask the average American

Untitled

9 person what's GNEP, can you explain GNEP, Global
10 Nuclear Energy Partnership. We're going to bring
11 nuclear waste from plants all over the world and take
12 waste and bring it into America. And if you ever
13 explained it properly, they'd flip out. They just
14 don't realize it.

15 And then the next page we have a piece of
16 pork that Professor Bepler and Professor Heckanov
17 are want to -- I think it's going to be on the Test
18 Site for reprocessing. Reprocessing, which we
19 haven't done since 1979 when President Carter stopped
20 it. So we have no expertise at all. We're starting
21 from ground zero.

22 And what this will do is undercut our fight
23 against Yucca Mountain, because we're going to put
24 reprocessing interim storage of nuclear waste interim
25 storage on the Test Site. And they're going to get

6

1 funded. I forget what it is, \$250 million I think.
2 So they're going to have a program there. And what
3 Senator Reid and Senator Ensign did is undercut our
4 fight against Yucca Mountain with a piece of pork
5 that we don't need, because just because we're doing
6 reprocessing doesn't mean it isn't dangerous.

7 I checked on the web on Britain and Japan, a
8 series of accidents listed there. They used nitric
9 acid. I think the vessels malfunctioned, people got
10 hurt. Some people died. See, we don't know but
11 that's not a benign process. They're putting like a

Untitled

12 panacea. We're going to reprocess it, make the
13 future better. I don't know, and neither do they.
14 And I wish our two senators wouldn't have taken that
15 piece of pork. They should have just left it where
16 it was and have less of a deficit, less debt.