

OCT 10 2001

0071

552382

8 MS. van RONK: Thank you. It's van Ronk. It
9 ends with a K.

10 MODERATOR BROWN: Okay. And following Ruth,
11 because of a flying schedule, I'm going to ask Greg
12 Jaczko, of Senator Reid's office, to make a brief
13 presentation, then we'll go on to Kalynda Tilges and
14 Leana Hildebrand. So Ruth, welcome.

15 MS. van RONK: I'm Ruth van Ronk, and I am a
16 resident of Pahrump for more than 30 years. I'm here
17 to present some excerpts of a 20-page paper presented
18 to the Association for Women Geoscientists, Scientists
19 for Indigenous People. And the paper's written by
20 Albert K. Bates, University of Oregon School of Law.
21 It's a copyrighted paper, and partially entitled
22 "Nuclear Waste and Natural Rights." There are at least
23 three -- three distributional injustices in the public
24 health impacts of nuclear energy: Medical, spatial and
25 temporal. The medical inequity relates to the varying

0072

1 abilities of different persons to withstand exposure to
2 radiation. We can never know the specific
3 circumstances of every human exposure, the amount and

552382

4 rate of radiation, the type, gamma, beta, alpha,
5 neutron, low LET, high LET of radiation received. The
6 physical and biological pathways, the duration and
7 frequencies of the exposures, age, health and sex of
8 the individual, the influence of other environmental
9 carcinogens and genetic predisposition and the
10 synergistic multiple effects of other risk factors.

11 Because of these, and other uncertainties, we
12 will not be able to say for certain in most individual
13 cases whether the effects on particular persons are
14 traceable to any discrete source or even to ionizing
15 radiation generally. The unfair spatial distribution
16 is related to the NIMBY reaction, something
17 governmental regulators almost invariably encounter
18 when trying to site a potentially polluting facility.
19 With few exceptions, the NIMBY selection brings about a
20 selection of sites with the lowest human population,
21 resulting in an inequitable burden of risk that falls
22 most heavily on those who live farthest from population
23 centers, and have the least political visibility.

24 Temporal inequities are those arising from
25 the transfer of health effects, economic costs, and

0073

552382

1 various other risks to future generations. This
2 article is primarily concerned with the temporal
3 qualities of radiation on human health.

4 Okay, then he goes into the presentation of
5 KERMA, which is an acronym for Kinetic Energy Released
6 in Material. Refers to a known quantum of radiation
7 exposure based upon release rates, shielding and other
8 factors, or more simply dose. In microphysics, in
9 nature, energy is regularly cast off from unstable
10 atomic structures in the form of gamma waves, free
11 electrons or beta waves or proton-neutron pairs, alpha
12 particles.

13 Wait a minute.

14 When these particles or energies leave their
15 previous residences and radiate outward, they are
16 capable of imparting an electrical charge to other
17 matter that are encountered and so are called ionizing
18 radiation. KERMA is therefore slightly accelerated
19 entropy of biological systems. In the human cells,
20 certain chemical bonds are crucial to the integrity of
21 the genetic code, and breaking just a few of these
22 bonds may endow the code with a permanent alteration.

552382

23 When a mutated gene is responsible for regulating
24 normal cell growth, an uncontrolled proliferation of
25 damaged cells or cancer can develop. When mutation
0074

1 occurs in the procreative cells, or in the developing
2 embryo, birth defects can result. When mutation occurs
3 in the blood-forming tissue, impairment of the immune
4 response system can result, and this can increase
5 susceptibility to an entire spectrum of human disease.

6 Radiation is therefore said to be mutagenic,
7 carcinogenic, and immunosuppressing. All of these
8 effects which begin at a submicroscopic level remain
9 invisible for extended periods of time until they reach
10 observable proportions. The latent period may be
11 decades, in the case of an incipient cancer, or it may
12 be centuries in the case a genetic effect.

13 MODERATOR BROWN: You're at five minutes now.

14 MS. van RONK: Little bit?

15 MODERATOR BROWN: Okay.

16 MS. van RONK: Thank you. The gaps in our
17 knowledge, some 240 radionuclides are considered to be
18 significant byproducts of the use of uranium fuel and
19 fission reactors. Some of these isotopes like radium

552382

20 226 and uranium 238 have been studied for almost a
21 century. Others have been studied very little. Much
22 of what we would like to know for reliable risk
23 analysis is not merely unknown, but at least for the
24 present, unknowable. If the rate of exposure is
25 unknown, so is the full potential for impact on human

0075

1 health.

2 On the positive side, even if low-level
3 radiation can induce cancer and genetic defects, future
4 discoveries in prevention and cure of cancer and
5 genetically-related diseases and genetic engineering
6 may negate many of these effects. Although predicting
7 the course of scientific discoveries thousands of years
8 into the future is indeed impossible, we mere mortals
9 may nonetheless make educated guesses based upon known
10 physics. And then I must direct attention to pages 16
11 and 18 of this report, which are tables of cancer
12 deaths per million person rem, presented by various
13 sources over a period of time, 1972 through '86, and
14 the range of this --

15 MODERATOR BROWN: Do you want to submit the
16 entire statement?

552382

17 MS. van RONK: Yeah, yeah, and the other one

18 is the same in dollars per life.

19 MODERATOR BROWN: Okay.

20 MS. van RONK: What's your life worth?

21 MODERATOR BROWN: Okay.

22 MS. van RONK: Thank you.