

MR. WOLFE: Can you hear me? I am pleased to be here. I represent the organization ACRE, Americans for Clean Responsible Energy. It's a group of technical experts living in the San Francisco bay area.

I personally am a member of the National Academy of Engineering, a past president of the American Nuclear Society. And I'm a pioneer in the development of peaceful nuclear energy. I started in the peaceful nuclear energy field at the time of President Eisenhower's 1954 peace program.

I might just mention to the lady who spoke a minute ago about the start of the peaceful nuclear energy program, that it was put out by President Eisenhower because he was afraid that we were developing nuclear weapons around the world.

He said it was going to many nations and he said all nations may develop nuclear weapons. The peaceful nuclear program was developed so that we would exchange our peaceful nuclear energy with people abroad with the understanding or the agreement that, in fact, they would not use it and would not use any -- make any attempt for nuclear weapons.

And I think Eisenhower may be looking down on us now, despite a couple in India and in Pakistan, he may be looking down at us now with pride considering that within the past 50 years, we have had no nuclear weapon wars or use of nuclear weapons and very few organizations which have developed nuclear weapons.

When I joined the peaceful nuclear energy industry in 1955, public sentiment -- public safety has been the key requirement in all of the industry. Not a single member of the public has been injured by peaceful nuclear energy activities that meet U.S. standards and those of the western areas.

In a sense, the 1979 Three-Mile-Island accident can be viewed as a measure of success. Despite the fuel melting and the reactor damage, the safety design of the plant was such that the radiation reaching the public was less than that which would have been received if they had taken a two-week vacation in Denver, the people of Three-Mile-Island.

Nature's radiation is higher in Denver than around TMI, and people in Denver live longer. Chernobyl would not have been allowed here, and the Soviets are now adopting our nuclear safety requirements.

1 The radiation allowed to reach the surface from the underground Yucca Mountain Nuclear Waste Repository is less than a 10th of what we normally receive from nature -- what we are receiving from nature. And the data indicates that this extra low-level -- extra low-level radiation, such as that in Denver, may be healthy. That people live longer in Denver, people live longer in the Rocky Mountains where there's higher radiation levels than they do in Washington and Oregon where there's low natural radiation levels. And there are other data that show the same thing.

But what about the transportation? We have heard about all of the -- the problems with transportation.

I think that Bob Levinson (sic) has given you the answer. But the real transportation (sic) we face today are from such common carriers as gasoline trucks and the 50,000 deaths each year from automobile accidents. Why don't we have talks here about outlawing automobiles?

2 Nuclear waste shipments are required to have such strong packaging and containment requirements -- and this is what Bob just said -- that even in an accident, the probability of significant radiation leakage is small. And there have been, for the past 40-odd years, some 3,000 shipments in this country; and there has been no effect on this country, negative effect.

3

Yucca Mountain has been and is still being carefully studied by technical experts. The nuclear industry and the U.S. regulatory authorities will not let it be operated if they find significant dangers to the public. The real danger, in my view, is the potential future lack of nuclear energy. Except for nuclear energy, there is no available means to significantly mitigate the global warming projections for fossil fuel use.

FACILITATOR HOLMES: You are at the four-minute mark.

MR. WOLFE: Okay. Or to meet the tripling of world energy needs in the coming decades as the third world grows, as it increases its standard of living and its energy use. I think the Indian reservations are going to suffer as much as the rest of us, if nuclear energy doesn't move.

The problem in the nuclear energy industry at Yucca Mountain, the problem we face today results from the lack of immediate need for energy expansion. In the '60's when energy use was doubling every ten years, the Sierra Club was a proponent of nuclear energy. Since the Arab oil boycott of '73 when energy prices went up and the growth dropped, we have had a surplus of energy. Now the Sierra Club is against nuclear energy.

What are they for? They are against coal; they are against oil; they are against gas; they are against geothermal power. What are they for? They are for solar and wind power, which can make a real big impact on the energy needs of the nation and the world.

Now, someday in the '60's, when the need for nuclear energy was recognized -- someday, as in the '60's, when the need for nuclear energy is recognized, the Sierra Club and the other antinuclear environmental organizations will become again nuclear energy proponents.

4

We should be moving to get Yucca Mountain -- but we can't wait for that, and we should be moving to get Yucca Mountain built and operated and revive nuclear energy in the United States for the welfare of our children and grandchildren.

We really have problems in energy if we don't get nuclear energy moving quickly now. Thank you.

MS. SWEENEY: Thank you, sir.

FACILITATOR HOLMES: Thank very much. Again, let me call Jay Lindberg.

2