



Tools for Democracy

Get Informed

Take Action

Use the Toolbox

SEARCH:

GO

Environment:

Air Pollution

Air pollution is one of the most widely recognized and visible environmental health problems. [Clear the Air](#), a collaborative effort of major national environmental groups explains:

"Despite our efforts to combat air pollution over the past thirty years, serious air quality problems remain throughout the nation. Air quality has remained poor and even deteriorated in many parts of the country. The Environmental Protection Agency estimates that nearly half our entire population -110 million Americans - breathe and live in areas with unhealthy air. From the aggravation of respiratory problems such as asthma and emphysema to premature death, air pollution is taking its toll on America's health.

Air pollution is also destroying our environment, causing acid rain, ozone damage to trees and crops, mercury contamination, and global warming. Power plants are the number one industrial source of the air pollutants causing these problems. Tackling power plant emissions, especially those from older, more polluting coal-burning plants, is imperative, if we ever want to clear the air."

- Clear the Air [\[source\]](#)

For more information on this and other related issues, visit [Clear the Air](#) on the Internet.

Organizations

[Clear the Air](#)

- a national public education campaign to improve air quality by reducing emissions from coal-burning power plants

[Greenpeace](#)

[Natural Resources Defense Council \(NRDC\)](#)

Resources

[Greenpeace - Renewable Energy Reports](#)

[Clear the Air - Regional Power Plant Campaigns](#)

[Clear the Air - Fact Sheets and Reports](#)

[Clear the Air - News](#)

[NRDC - Air Pollution](#)

Action / Campaigns

[Clear the Air - Regional Power Plant Campaigns](#)

[Clear the Air - Take Action!](#)

Would you like to see your organization featured on this page? [Contact Us!](#)



Tools for Democracy

Environment:

Deforestation

Unsustainable logging practices have consequences felt across ecosystems and cultures. On the local, state, national, and international levels, citizen-based campaigns are challenging those industries that compromise our heritage for the sake of a quick profit. Consider the domestic efforts of the [Heritage Forests Campaign](#):

"51% of America's National Forests are already open to logging, mining, and drilling.

The U.S. Forest Service issued the Forest protection policy in January 2001 after the most extensive public rulemaking in history, encompassing more than 600 public hearings and a record-breaking 1.6 million comments, (95 percent of which supported the strongest possible protection).

The Policy protects the last 31% of our National Forests from logging and drilling. Without protection, the timber, mining, and oil & gas special interests could threaten 80% of our forests. Once these forests are gone, they're gone forever.

But, recently the Bush administration announced it would propose changes in June to this popular forest conservation policy. While the Bush administration said it would uphold the protections, it proposed implementation on a forest-by-forest basis, giving a blank check to the timber industry to log these precious lands."

- Heritage Forests Campaign [\[source\]](#)

For more information on this and other issues, visit the [Heritage Forests Campaign](#) on the Internet.

Organizations

[Greenpeace](#)

[Heritage Forests Campaign](#)

[Rainforest Action Network \(RAN\)](#)

[World Resources Institute \(WRI\)](#)

[World Rainforest Movement \(WRM\)](#)

Resources

[Heritage Forests Campaign - Overview of Problem](#)

[Heritage Forests Campaign - Partner Organizations](#)

[Greenpeace - Forests](#)

[Rainforest Action Network \(RAN\) - Stop Boise Cascade - Campaign to Save Endangered Forests](#)

Action / Campaigns

[Heritage Forests Campaign - Take Action](#)

[Rainforest Action Network \(RAN\) - Stop Boise Cascade - Campaign to Save Endangered Forests](#)

[Greenpeace - Take Action Against Amazon Deforestation](#)

[WRM - Action Alerts](#)

Would you like to see your organization featured on this page? [Contact Us!](#)

[About Citizen Works](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Jobs/Internships](#)
ALL CONTENT © 2004 CITIZEN WORKS



Tools for Democracy

Get Informed

Take Action

Use the Toolbox

SEARCH:

GO

Environment:

Global Warming

Many scientists warn that global warming (also known as global climate change) is the greatest environmental threat faced by our planet; it also serves as the most poignant example of how corporate abuse impacts both people and the natural environment. The [Sierra Club](#) describes this phenomenon:

"The Earth is only 5 to 9 degrees warmer today than it was 10,000 years ago during the last ice age. Throughout history, major shifts in temperature occurred at a rate of a few degrees over thousands of years. They were accompanied by radical ecological changes, including the extinction of many species.

Manmade global warming is occurring much faster - faster, in fact, than at any time in the past 10,000 years. Unless we slow and ultimately reverse the buildup of greenhouse gases, we will have decades, not millennia, to try to adapt to radical changes in weather patterns, sea levels and serious threats to human health. Increased flooding, storms and agricultural losses could devastate our economy. Plants and animals that cannot adapt to new conditions will become extinct. The world's leading scientists project that during our children's lifetimes, global warming will raise the average temperature of the planet by 2.7 to 11 degrees Fahrenheit.

But How Much of a Difference Can a Few Degrees Make? P L E N T Y.

The human race is engaged in the largest and most dangerous experiment in history - an experiment to see what will happen to our health and the health of our planet when we change our atmosphere and our climate. This is not some deliberate scientific inquiry. It is an uncontrolled experiment on the environment of the Earth, and we're gambling our children's future on its outcome. The results of this pollution are already significant. We have increased levels of carbon dioxide (CO₂), the primary global warming gas, in our atmosphere by 30 percent in the past 100 years. Some regions of the world have

Organizations

[Union of Concerned Scientists](#)

[Sierra Club](#)

[Greenpeace](#)

[Global Warming Information Page](#)

- news, global warming's impact on: consumers, national defense, farmers, industry, seniors, small business; articles, testimonies to the Senate Committee on the Environment

[Safe Climate](#)

- a nonprofit venture of the [World Resources Institute](#) which "provides the tools, products, and connections to help you take positive action in your home, organization, and local community."

[Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change \(IPCC\)](#)

- the IPCC was founded by the World Meteorological Organization and the United Nations Environmental Program to serve as an international governmental institution to study and act upon the dangers of global climate change.

[OneWorld.net](#)

Resources

[Sierra Club - Global Warming](#)

- campaigns, info on global warming, clean energy alternatives, ten things you can do, global warming maps, news

[Sierra Club - Global Warming articles and factsheets](#)

[Sierra Club - Global Warming Resources for Activists](#)

[Greenpeace - Climate Countdown](#)

[Safe Climate - Carbon Footprint Calculator](#)

- allows individuals and/or organizations to calculate their

already warmed by as much as 5 degrees Fahrenheit. Physicians at Harvard University and Johns Hopkins medical schools and other medical institutions have issued grim assessments that global warming may already be causing the spread of infectious diseases and increasing heat-wave deaths. Extreme weather events have become more common. Plants and animals around the world are shifting their ranges in an effort to escape a changing climate.

The rapid buildup of greenhouse gases in our atmosphere is the source of the problem. By burning ever-increasing quantities of coal, oil and gas, we are choking our planet in a cloud of this pollution. If we don't begin to act now to curb global warming, our children will live in a world where the climate will be far less hospitable than it is today."

- Sierra Club [[source](#)]

For more information about global warming and other environmental phenomena, visit the [Sierra Club](#) on the Internet.

personal impact on global warming

Action / Campaigns

[Sierra Club - Ten Things You Can Do](#)

[Greenpeace - Climate Action](#)

[Safe Climate - Actions](#)

Would you like to see your organization featured on this page? [Contact Us!](#)

[Get Informed](#)[Take Action](#)[Use the Toolbox](#)

SEARCH:

GO

Environment:

Dioxin

Dioxins are highly toxic, very persistent and highly bio-accumulative by-products of industrial activities and products. More than 90 percent of human exposure to dioxins comes from our food, particularly meat, fish and dairy products. Our food supply is contaminated by industrial "fallout" that travels thousands of miles before ultimately bio-accumulating in vegetation, animal products and people.

According to the U.S. EPA, dioxins in vanishingly small amounts, even at existing background levels, can cause cancer and birth defects.

Dioxins are even more potent at disrupting the human hormone system, potentially leading to endometriosis, diabetes and immune suppression, among other problems.

EPA has also found that the sources of dioxin are a wide variety of industries ranging from waste incinerators, vinyl producing factories and paper mills to other human activities involving the burning of chlorine compounds. Dioxin emissions began to accumulate in the environment in the early part of the 20th century, peaking in the 1970s prior to rudimentary environmental regulations. As with many other forms of pollution, dioxin exposures tend to be higher among poor and politically marginal people, especially people of color. But current dioxin background levels exceed any margin of safety, meaning that we are all at risk from dioxins, and that any additional emissions can be expected to cause real damage to human health.

The implications of global dioxin contamination have ranged from last year's dioxin contamination of chickens in Belgium to the growing concern about dioxin emissions from garbage incinerators in Japan. Until now, dioxin contamination has largely plagued industrial countries. However, with the spread of polluting technologies such as incinerators and products containing PVC plastics, there is compelling evidence that dioxin emissions are set to increase in developing countries, unless a UN treaty aimed at eliminating dioxins is adopted.

Currently the U.S. uses "end-of-the-pipe" regulations, which attempt to reduce dioxin without fundamentally changing industrial practices. To begin reducing dioxin contamination to near pre-industrial levels, we must instead emphasize prevention: not permitting new dioxin sources, and eliminating existing sources.

As long ago as 1992, the International Joint Commission (IJC), a bi-national body of the US and Canada, recommended a prevention-oriented approach to reducing dioxin exposure—including changing industrial processes and phasing out chlorine chemistry—in the Great Lakes region. Given the new evidence in EPA's dioxin reassessment, these recommendations should now be applied to both US national and global UN dioxin policies.

We should immediately:

Stop issuing new permits for incinerators or combustion facilities that burn chlorinated chemicals, or any form of hazardous waste or mixed waste.

Stop issuing new permits for PVC plastic manufacturing facilities, and ban short-life uses of PVC plastics, including packaging, toys and non-essential medical supplies.

Stop issuing new permits for paper mills that use chlorine bleaching. Alternative bleaching technologies are available.

Allow U.S. farmers to grow industrial hemp, which is now imported in modest amounts but cannot be grown here; hemp-based paper products can be produced easily without the use of chlorine.

Modify the U.S. policy at current UN treaty negotiations to reject chemical-industry pressure and support the "elimination" rather than unspecified "reductions" of human-produced dioxin.

In the longer term, we should:

Phase out the use of chlorine-containing compounds as industrial raw materials. This would imply phasing out all manufacture of PVC plastics.

Phase out all industrial processes which create dioxins and other persistent organic pollutants.

Phase out all incinerators and combustion facilities that burn chlorinated compounds, or any kind of hazardous or mixed waste.

Require existing paper mills that use chlorine bleaching to adopt new technologies.

Although the dioxin reassessment confirms that dioxins are a human-caused problem which endangers the health of the general population, the dioxin problem is almost entirely preventable. According to EPA's reassessment, the levels of dioxin in ancient human tissue were 2 percent of what they are in people living in the US today. By pursuing policies of prevention and precaution, the formation of new dioxins can be eliminated and background levels, now threatening the general US population, can be reduced as dramatically as they were increased over the last century.



Tools for Democracy

[Get Informed](#)[Take Action](#)[Use the Toolbox](#)

SEARCH:

GO

Environment:

Sprawl

Nearly everyone but the most brazen of developers now opposes sprawl. Sprawl fuels racial polarization and social inequity, causes air pollution, destroys farmland and rural communities, siphons resources away from urban communities and undermines the quality of life for tens of millions through gridlock, loss of green space, wasted commuting time, cultural homogeneity and numerous other blights on community well-being.

Often unrecognized in the analysis of sprawl is its perverse effect on communities of color and low-income communities that suffer multiple kinds of harm from sprawl-related disinvestment. As businesses and jobs migrate to suburbs, the urban poor may not be able to get to better-paying jobs -- they may not be able to afford cars, and public transportation may be expensive, highly inconvenient or nonexistent. Racial segregation is also entrenched through "transit racism," the practice of deliberately planning routes in ways that effectively segregate people of color and low-income people from middle-class whites.

While criticizing sprawl is easy, few politicians are willing to identify its underlying causes, confront the developer interests which favor sprawl, and advance a policy agenda to effect real change in development patterns.

The sources of sprawl include under-investment in urban schools and communities; massive investment in roads and highways at the expense of public transit; local and state corporate tax welfare that encourages development in undeveloped areas, and federal subsidies for suburban roads, sewers and services. These factors and others intermix in a complicated dynamic that produces sprawling metropolitan areas that leave everyone unhappy -- from rural residents to those in idyllic suburbs that suddenly suffer from traffic jams, to those in urban areas.

Given the complexity of the problem, only a broad policy package offers hope of meaningful solutions. Many elements of such a policy must be implemented at the state and local level; but key decisions rest with the federal government. Among other measures, the federal government should:

- * rapidly ratchet up its support for public transportation;
- * provide funds for the rehabilitation of old schools in old neighborhoods, not just construction of new schools;
- * build more affordable housing and invest in urban neighborhoods; and
- * support state and local efforts to encourage smarter development,

rein in sprawl, and preserve farmland.

[About Citizen Works](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Jobs/Internships](#)
ALL CONTENT © 2004 CITIZEN WORKS

[Get Informed](#)[Take Action](#)[Use the Toolbox](#)

SEARCH:

GO

Environment:

Energy Policy

Federal policy over the past century has largely failed to promote an energy system based on safe, secure, economically affordable, and environmentally benign energy sources. The tax code, budget appropriations, and regulatory processes overwhelmingly have been used to subsidize dependence on fossil fuels and nuclear power. The result: increased sickness and premature deaths, depleted family budgets, acid rain destruction of lakes, forests, and crops, oil spill contamination, polluted rivers and loss of aquatic species and the long-term peril of climate change and radioactive waste dumps—not to mention a dependency on external energy supplies.

There is an alternative. Three decades of detailed assessments, on-the-ground results, and a flood of research and development innovations in the energy-consuming devices used in our buildings, vehicles and industries, undeniably show that energy efficiency, renewable energy technologies, and natural gas as a bridging fuel are superior energy options for society. They offer a present and future path that is economically attractive, safe and secure from large-scale or long-term risks or threats to public health, future generations, and the environment.

Under the thumb of the dirty fuel industries, Congress and the Executive branch refuse to take even the most modest, common sense measures. For example, when the President's Committee of Advisors on Science and Technology concluded in a 1997 report that doubling the Department of Energy's efficiency R&D funding would produce a 40 to 1 return on the investment for the nation, Congress responded by proposing deep cuts in the efficiency and renewables R&D budgets.

Energy Innovations: A Prosperous Path to a Clean Environment, a joint study recently prepared by half a dozen of the nation's prominent energy and environmental research and advocacy groups, shows that a simple and straightforward list of policy measures implemented in the next few years could produce:

a 64 percent reduction in sulfur dioxide (SO₂) emissions (prime cause of acid rain) by 2010, compared to 1990 levels;

a 27 percent reduction in nitrogen oxide (NO_x) emissions (a key precursor of ground-level ozone, smog);

deep cuts in emissions of other damaging pollutants, including fine particles, toxic metals like mercury, and hydrocarbons;

reduction in U.S. carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions to 10 percent below 1990 levels by 2010, compared to a 21 percent increase under business as usual;

consumer net savings reaching \$58 billion per year, equivalent to \$530 per household by 2010; and

oil use reductions totaling 4.5 million barrels of oil per day (mb/d), reducing the U.S. oil import bill by \$12 billion a year (oil use would be 16 mb/d instead of 20.5 projected for 2010).

These are the minimum goals the United States must set and achieve. Key policies to reach and exceed these savings include:

an end to fossil fuel and nuclear corporate welfare supports, including numerous special tax preferences;

a robust federal research and development program in sustainable renewable energy sources, so that the energy-independence promises of wind, solar and other forms of renewable energy are finally realized;

much higher fuel efficiency (CAFE) standards (at least to 45 miles per gallon for cars and 35 miles per gallon for light trucks, to be phased in over five years) during a transition period to zero-emissions cars;

stronger efficiency standards for appliances and mandatory energy performance building codes;

ensuring electricity policies which promote efficient use of electricity through a range of measures including "net metering"—requirements that companies pay market prices for electricity generated by consumers and passed back to the utility—and elimination of clean air exemptions for "grandfathered" fossil fuel facilities; and

the establishment of a well-funded employee transition assistance fund and job-retraining program for displaced coal miners—easily affordable with the savings from greater energy efficiency.



Tools for Democracy

[Get Informed](#)[Take Action](#)[Use the Toolbox](#)

SEARCH:

GO

Environment:

Environmental Justice

Too often, communities can be disrupted, even destroyed, by some of the more environmentally hazardous features of modern society: toxic dumps, chemical factories, waste incinerators, power plants.

Unfortunately, private industry and public planners too often choose to locate such facilities in places where most residents are poor or are minorities. Until recently, federal agencies responsible for enforcing the nation's civil rights laws completely overlooked this form of discrimination.

Beginning in the 1980s, often in response to proposals to site environmentally hazardous facilities in predominately minority and low-income neighborhoods, communities around the country organized themselves to respond to threats to their environments. They sought to raise awareness of, and concern about, the disproportionate health burdens and risks borne by some populations due, in significant part, to the unequal implementation and enforcement of environmental protection laws. These local efforts have created what is now generally known as the environmental justice movement.

Environmental justice means the fair treatment of all people with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws and policies. Fair treatment in turn means that no specific group (whether defined by race, color, national origin or income-level) should bear a disproportionate share of negative environmental consequences from industrial, municipal, or commercial operations, and that all environmental policy decisions should be made in an open and non-discriminatory way. Environmental justice stands for the principle that all people and communities are entitled to equal treatment under our environmental, public health, and civil rights laws.

A disproportionate environmental burden is imposed on many minority communities, people of color and other marginalized communities for a variety of reasons, but the main reason is the perceived powerlessness of the people who live there. The fact that minority communities often live closest to polluting industries, dumps, and major transportation hubs means they often get the worst quality air, low water quality, and a reduced quality of life.

Like many civil rights issues, the reasons for this disproportionate treatment may be intentional or unintentional; either way, the injustice is real, and must be addressed. There is a distinct racial component involved in environmental injustice that goes beyond the targeting of low-income communities. Under our nation's civil rights law, proof of conscious prejudice, although it certainly exists in many cases, is not required. Simple disregard for the race of affected communities and their history that results in disproportionate treatment is also a form of racism.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits recipients of federal financial assistance (such as state environmental departments) from discriminating on the basis of race, color, or national origin in their programs or activities. Environmental Justice advocates had begun using Title VI as a tool to address specific instances of environmental racism in federally funded programs.

We support the following steps to address past and present environmental injustice:

The backlog of environmental justice complaints must be addressed expeditiously and fairly, and all future complaints must be investigated and vigorously pursued in accordance with Title VI and EPA's implementing regulations.

Environmental Justice complaints must be treated as seriously and under the same legal standards as other types of civil rights complaints. Targets of environmental racism must not be forced to meet scientific burdens of proof that do not apply in cases of discrimination in housing, or employment, or other federal programs in order to seek redress.

Public participation in environmental decision-making processes is essential, and this must not be confined to a comment period at the end after vital decisions have been made. Instead, the affected citizens and communities must be involved in the planning, with meetings in their vicinity during hours they can attend.

When hearings are held in distant locations, funding should be provided for transportation, to ensure that all interested groups have a chance to be heard - not only those who can afford to travel to Washington or hire lobbyists to represent them.

Considerations of disproportionate impact must address cumulative impacts. Currently, all challenges must go chemical by chemical, exposure route by route, facility by facility, although exposed people often have multiple exposures to many hazards. The overall geographic distribution of environmental burdens need to be weighed, and the precautionary principle should be applied to assure prompt, appropriate action.

The principle of reverse onus should apply so that the companies who make or use these chemicals is preferable to the current model, where communities need to prove individual chemicals are unsafe. Instead, companies producing novel chemicals or using novel processes should have to prove that they are safe within known parameters.

Risk analysis must not be used to provide cover for a harmful project ("an acceptable number of deaths or injuries will occur as the cost of doing business"), but instead should have to examine competing alternatives to the polluting process proposed.

Pollution credits trading must end. Nobody has the right to pollute, and all too often we see a general good (like getting low mileage cars off the road) traded for a specific evil (like allowing an outdated and dangerous refinery to continue operations). And all too often it is poor people or people of color who live in the sacrifice zone.

Citizens harmed by environmental injustice should receive full compensation, punitive damages where appropriate, and high-quality medical care, in addition to remedies to end the disproportionate

environmental impact. The government must also consider the proper care and compensation for victims made chemically sensitive due to chronic or acute exposures.

Indigenous tribal communities, with sovereign governments whose environmental policy structures have been kept underfunded since federal work began in the 1970s, face a tougher challenge than even those with some state framework. This happened despite the fact that the original treaties that set up the native reservations often contained provisions about air and water quality, as well as wildlife and other environmental allowances. Adequate funding and support must be made available to tribal governments through the federal system.

Finally, a long-range goal of environmental justice is pollution prevention—clean, sustainable industrial processes, without any toxic pollution to damage our health and shorten our lives. On the long road to this goal, however, we must make sure that we do not conveniently dump a disproportionate share of our problems on those who receive the least benefit from our economy, and have the smallest voice in our political system.

[About Citizen Works](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Jobs/Internships](#)

ALL CONTENT © 2004 CITIZEN WORKS



Tools for Democracy

Environment:

The Dangers of Genetic Engineering

Genetic engineering has far outrun the science that must be its first governing discipline. Many unknowns attend the insertion of genes across species, from ecological risks to food allergies—and even more frightening uncertainties surround the effort to clone humans or manipulate human germlines—that is, to breed genetically modified humans. These unknowns beg for investigation, before biotech corporations or their indentured researchers introduce unintended hazards into the natural environment.

In the industry, corporate greed has eclipsed sound science and the humility and caution that should be manifest in contemplations of "Changing the Nature of Nature," as Martin Teitel and Kimberly Wilson subtitled their recent book Genetically Engineered Food, which should serve as a primer on that issue for all citizens and government regulators. Compounding the problem, government regulators have abandoned their duty to protect the public, choosing instead a mission of industry boosterism.

The result has been a rush to introduce genetically altered seeds into the natural environment without adequate testing; a frenzy to patent genes, seeds and life forms and to extend monopolistic control over the very material of life; a transformation of university culture so that traditional values of openness and shared information are increasingly replaced by proprietary agreements and a focus on personal, university and corporate bottom lines; and an effort to foist genetically altered food on an unknowing public that would reject biotech foods if notified and given alternatives. Even more serious perils lie in the near future, as biotech companies increasingly focus on manipulating human germlines, the prospect of genetic discrimination rises and researchers such as Princeton's Lee Silver openly predict the creation of "Genrich" and "Natural" classes of people.

The Taco Bell crisis and the mixing of genetically altered corn—not approved for human consumption—into the nation's corn supply reveals how poorly government regulators have been doing their job. Indeed, it was not the FDA, but biotech activists, who discovered the problem.

It is time to re-establish priorities. Protection of human health and the environment must take precedence over corporate efforts to rush the latest product to market and please investors. The commodification of life must be stopped. Sci-fi-like proclamations about "improving" the human species through germline modification must not be permitted to translate into public policy. We must:

Halt the release of genetically altered plants into the environment until comprehensive, independent studies are performed as to environmental and food-safety risks under a regulatory framework.

Exempt life forms from the purview of patent laws in order to allow broader research and safety testing opportunities by academia and government.

Place liability for harm on the owners or licensees of biotechnology patent rights in the event of damages caused by environmental release.

Label all food containing any genetically altered ingredients.

Ban the genetic manipulation of human embryos—cloning or germline manipulation—for reproductive purposes.

Adopt much more rigorous personal and institutional conflict-of-interest rules for recipients of federal research funding; ever-tightening corporate-university alliances undermine the independence and critical detachment needed from academia to monitor corporate biotech schemes.

[About Citizen Works](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Jobs/Internships](#)

ALL CONTENT © 2004 CITIZEN WORKS



Tools for Democracy

Environment:

Nuclear Power

It is time to end the use of nuclear power in the United States. Nuclear energy is too dangerous, too inefficient, too costly, and poses too many long-term hazards.

Rather than learning from Chernobyl, the U.S. nuclear industry argues that this kind of accident could not happen here. In fact, a nuclear accident could occur at a U.S. power plant that would release radiation comparable to that released in Chernobyl. U.S. reactors are much more dangerous than the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and the nuclear industry suggest. At least five reactors in this country have experienced partial core-melt accidents. Aside from catastrophic accidents, reactors are prone to numerous small accidents, as well as "routine" releases of small amounts of radioactivity.

Reactors also produce high-level radioactive wastes with intractable storage problems. High-level nuclear waste will be hazardous for more than 200,000 years—longer than our ability to isolate it from the biosphere. It is technologically impossible and scientifically irresponsible to 'dispose' of nuclear waste. Even attempts to dispose of low-level radioactive waste have failed. Every low-level radioactive waste dump in this country leaks.

The Department of Energy is considering Yucca Mountain in Nevada as a site for "permanent disposal." A leak could contaminate the groundwater beneath the Mountain and jeopardize the health of nearby residents. An earthquake in the area (and since 1976 there have been hundreds of serious seismic events within a 50-mile radius) could cause a rise in groundwater levels that would flood the repository. If the Yucca Mountain site is approved, waste will be transported there through 43 states, past the homes, workplaces and schools of 50 million Americans. The Department of Energy estimates that at least 50 and as many as 310 accidents would occur. An Energy Department study found that a severe accident in a rural area could contaminate a 42-square-mile area, require over a year to "clean up", and cost \$620 million.

We should:

- Phase out commercial nuclear reactors within five years, and set a timetable for phasing out other dangerous nuclear technologies, , nuclear-waste incinerators, food irradiation and all military and commercial uses of depleted uranium.
- Ban long-distance transport of high-level nuclear waste.
- Assure that stored nuclear waste is continuously monitored, with public access to monitoring data, unless and until a method can be found to assure its isolation from the biosphere for the duration of its

hazardous life. The government should not relieve companies that generate nuclear waste from their responsibility for its dangers.

- Redirect federal funding from nuclear energy research to renewable energy technology.
- Stop federal government promotion of nuclear energy, and U.S. companies selling nuclear technology, internationally.

[About Citizen Works](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Jobs/Internships](#)
ALL CONTENT © 2004 CITIZEN WORKS