

Pauline Gannon

As a many-year citizen of Alaska, I am very concerned about the state's plan to bring more radioactive materials to Alaska. I realize energy concerns are ongoing, but do not want us to be looking at a ten-year fix which then leaves us with more disposal and contamination problems. Not just installing in a small unit, Nuclear energy has a life cycle from mining the uranium, to enrichment, through disposing of nuclear waste that is expensive. It has been linked to severe health and environmental problems. There are many impacts to consider for Alaska including environmental, health, food security and safety, and cultural economic concerns. The state should be putting efforts into renewable resources, not ones that leave us with lifelong contamination and spent-cell storage sites. We still have contaminated sites and detritus located at many sites around our state. Many sites that were connected to military or mining/resource extraction activities that are still a concern from half a century ago. If Alaska continues to be unable to provide infrastructure support such as transportation and our ferry system, health supports for disease prevention, and education providing elementary through university support due to our budgetary problems, we certainly should not be setting ourselves up for more clean-up problems that have big financial costs in the future. Corporations that had a part in "making the messes" seem to disappear and leave government and it's citizens holding the bag.

We may not be able to stop the military from doing their micro-reactor trial here, yet much of the lands they have been granted to use and train on are contaminated in multiple ways. As the efforts to do other clean ups (such as PFAS) have shown, they are perhaps band-aids but do not truly undo the harm that was caused. Supposedly, all US taxpayers get to help pay for cleaning up their messes, yet many are not resolved. However, we should not be pushing for increasing the expansion of more nuclear radioactive materials throughout the state due to short-term gratification energy solutions while leaving long term problems likely to affect human and animal/fish resources, soils and agriculture potentials, as well as industries such as tourism. Climate and weather pattern changes bring additional concerns. If we were to plan on dispersing this micro nuclear energy source around the state, how will maintenance and refueling be planned and paid for? After the initial ten-year fuel cell life, can it not leave yet another rusting, eroding problem on the landscape seeping into fragile soils or being toppled into a river or the ocean? We should not be getting ahead of ourselves without answers to these concerns. Just hoping that good solutions will come to light sometime in the future is not adequate planning. We need to be reducing the problems in the legacy we are leaving for our children and grandchildren, not adding to them.