

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO DR. MILDRED M.
ALLEN

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 3, 2002

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Dr. Mildred M. Allen, a leading advocate in the mental health field, who has dedicated the past 17 years to making the Fordham-Tremont Community Mental Health Center a viable and effective mental health facility that performs at a superior level.

Dr. Allen was born in Guayanilla, Puerto Rico, where she lived until graduation from the University of Puerto Rico. Here, she earned a Bachelor of Arts Degree and went on to obtain a Masters of Social Work, a Masters in Public Administration, and a Doctorate in Art and Science from New York University. Armed with this extensive education and training, Dr. Allen went on to play a pivotal role in New York's mental health arena.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Allen has been a key participant in numerous state, national, and global conferences on mental health. In 1985 and 1987, she was a panelist at the World Congresses in Mental Health held in England and Egypt, respectively. Dr. Allen's contributions to mental health public administration include the first city-wide conference on Domestic Violence which she organized in 1985. In 1986, Governor Cuomo appointed her to the Manhattan Children's Psychiatric Center Board of Visitors. She continues to be an active member, and often officer, of many key boards that focus on various aspects of mental health. Dr. Allen's concern for the Puerto Rican community, particularly its youth, led her to create the Hispanic Advocacy and Resource Center, Inc. in order to facilitate the adoption of Puerto Rican children and provide support to families. She also went on to co-found the Puerto Rican Empowerment Partnership Corp., a non-profit organization focused on improving the mental and social welfare of Puerto Ricans living in New York State.

Clearly, Dr. Allen will leave an undeniable mark on the world of mental health and has directly impacted the lives of an untold number of people. She is described as a truly kind and dynamic woman whose unyielding spirit inspires those around her. She has spent most of the last two decades in my district, sharing her gift and leading the Fordham-Tremont Community Mental Health Center to even greater success, with the support of an outstanding staff.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring Dr. Mildred Allen for her illustrious and distinguished career and in thanking her for her unceasing passion.

H.R. 3343

HON. TED STRICKLAND

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 3, 2002

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on the floor on many occasions about the damage brought to our nation's energy security as a result of the privatization of the United States Enrichment Corporation in July of 1998. Through the thorium cleanup legislation before us today, I am pleased Congress will take out an insurance policy to ensure that we have the capacity to produce the nuclear fuel needed to supply our nation's nuclear power reactors in the event of supply interruptions. That insurance policy authorizes the Secretary of Energy to carry out necessary activities at the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Piketon, Ohio to maintain our country's uranium enrichment capability. Such activities include placing 3 million Separative Work Units (SWU) of capacity on cold standby at the Piketon, Ohio facility.

I am pleased that the Speaker of the House, the Under Secretary of Energy Bob Card, and the Energy and Commerce Committee were able to work together to craft this legislation. I note that legislation to authorize Cold Standby at the Portsmouth plant was included as an amendment to the "Energy Advancement and Conservation Act of 2001" (H.R. 2587) during mark up in the Energy and Commerce Committee, but it was stripped in the Rules Committee and was not ruled in order as part of the package of amendments considered on the floor during debate on H.R. 4. I am pleased that there is bipartisan agreement on authorizing Cold Standby.

Today, over 20 percent of our nation's electricity supply comes from nuclear power. While there is general agreement that we should not be dependent on foreign supplies for our energy requirements, our country's nuclear fuel imports have increased dramatically in a few short years. Our nation now depends on imports for approximately 77 percent of the nuclear fuel that powers our nation's nuclear powered electricity plants. U.S. utilities require 11.0 million SWU of enrichment services each year; approximately 8.5 million SWU is imported and the remainder is produced at the Paducah, Kentucky plant operated by USEC. Approximately 5.5 million SWU comes from Russia as part of the US-Russian Highly Enriched Uranium (HEU) Agreement, and 3.0 million SWU are imported from European producers.

The Portsmouth uranium enrichment plant was shuttered by USEC, Inc. in June 2001, three years ahead of the earliest closure date agreed to in the "Treasury Agreement." The Treasury Agreement was intended to assure post-privatization compliance by USEC with the statutory requirements contained in the USEC Privatization Act of 1996, including the obligations to maintain a reliable and economic source of domestic uranium enrichment

services. The Treasury Agreement also was intended to see that operation of the Department of Energy's two uranium enrichment plants continued until December 31, 2004 or until new, more efficient laser based technology is deployed.

USEC terminated its laser-based technology development less than a year after privatization, and today it has no credible prospects for deploying new technology for the foreseeable future.

Indeed, NRC and industry reports reveal that USEC's finances are precarious at best. The USEC operated Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Paducah, Kentucky presently operates at a deficit, and there is widespread concern that USEC management will close this plant, leaving the U.S. completely dependent on foreign sources of fuel. I urge the Administration to prevent our nation from losing its entire enrichment industry and to take the steps needed to promote the deployment of competitive centrifuge technology at both Portsmouth and Paducah. It is ironic that 3 years ago the U.S. was in a position to be fully self-reliant for its own nuclear fuel supply and today we are on the verge of losing that capability.

A single, uneconomic enrichment plant and no foreseeable prospects for new enrichment technology is not what Congress intended when it authorized privatization of USEC. I note that the Energy Department has sent the Energy and Commerce Committee draft language providing the Secretary with the authority to operate the gaseous diffusion plants and to sell low enriched uranium in order to meet domestic requirements. I believe that once the Energy and Commerce Committee has had the chance to evaluate the proposed framework for assuring domestic enrichment supply, there will be support to take the additional steps to begin to repair the damage caused by the USEC Privatization.

There are a number of significant policy concerns associated with USEC's premature closing of the Portsmouth enrichment plant and the absence of replacement technology coming on-stream in the interim. Specifically, these challenges are:

(1) Loss of approximately one-half of the U.S. capability to produce enriched uranium;
 (2) Increased dependence on the Russian HEU Agreement such that a disruption could result in USEC's inability to meet its obligations. This raises both energy security concerns at home and national security concerns abroad with respect to enrichment and plutonium recycling (for example, the U.S. committed to supply Japan, South Korea and Taiwan with enriched uranium as an incentive to avoid use of plutonium based fuels for electricity generation);

(3) The U.S. government has liabilities and obligations under Sections 3108 and 3109 of the USEC Privatization Act to honor all sales contracts entered into by USEC prior to the date of privatization in the event USEC fails to fulfill its obligations;

(4) Today's trend toward just-in-time fuel procurement further increases vulnerability to supply disruption; and

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

(5) Next generation Pebble Bed Modular Reactors being developed by the utility industry require fuel enriched to 8 percent U 235, and the Portsmouth plant is the only facility in the U.S. that is licensed and capable of enriching uranium to that level. This will put the nation in the position of having to rely on imports for the next generation of nuclear reactors.

The September 18, 2000 DOE report entitled "Options for Government Response to Energy Security Challenges Facing the Nuclear Fuel Cycle" outlines a variety of scenarios where USEC would not be able to assure a reliable supply of uranium fuel.

Today's legislation authorizing DOE to maintain the Portsmouth enrichment plant on Cold Standby serves as an insurance policy for the nation's electricity supply against supply disruptions.

What exactly is entailed in Cold Standby?

Cold Standby involves placing those portions of the uranium enrichment plant needed for 3 million SWU/year production capability in a shut-down non-operational condition and performing surveillance and maintenance activities necessary to retain the ability to resume production after a set of restart activities are conducted. This involves treating the cells to remove uranium deposits, buffering the process cells with dry air to prevent wet air leakage (which would destroy the barrier equipment), installation of buffer cell alarms to insure that proper integrity is maintained, and establishing procedures to keep equipment in a safe condition capable of being restarted. Today this takes place under the oversight of a Nuclear Regulatory Commission certificate.

I am pleased that the Secretary of Energy was able to reprogram funding in April 2001 in order to place Portsmouth on Cold Standby when the plant closed in June of 2001 and to secure the funds needed to winterize these process buildings.

Long term, I believe the best way to fund Cold Standby is to use a portion of the \$1.2 billion in funds contained in the USEC Fund that are not already reserved under P.L. 105-204 for conversion of depleted uranium hexafluoride (DUF6). These funds are held in the Treasury and, during the previous administration, these funds were determined by the General Counsel of the Office of Management and Budget to be available for meeting the expenses of privatization. I urge the OMB to re-examine this as a source of funding for Cold Standby and to work with Congress to make these funds available.

Alternatively, the cost of Cold Standby can be met through the use of appropriated funds, as was accomplished in the FY 02 Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act. Either way, the nation will be purchasing insurance against the type of energy supply disruptions that could be worse than the problems witnessed in California earlier this year.

As we discussed in the Energy and Commerce Committee, this authority to fund "cold standby" is not intended to compete for funds from the Energy Department's environmental clean-up fund known as the Uranium Enrichment Decontamination & Decommissioning (UED&D) Fund.

While we are increasing the amount of funding from the UED&D Fund, it is important to me and my friends from Kentucky and Tennessee that the reimbursement for clean up at the thorium site does not shift funds from

clean up activities at the three uranium enrichment sites. It is also important that the burden for cleaning up the thorium site does not fall on nuclear power ratepayers. I know the intent of this substitute is to address both of those issues by holding harmless the uranium enrichment sites' cleanup schedule and protecting our nuclear ratepayers from shouldering the additional cost of cleaning up the site in West Chicago, Illinois.

I support this bill.

H.R. 3166—INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT IS THE BEST ECONOMIC STIMULUS

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 3, 2002

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the so-called economic stimulus legislation presented to the House is like that old story of throwing an eight-foot rope to a person who's drowning ten feet from shore: it just doesn't get there; there isn't enough rope.

Well, there isn't enough help in this initiative the Majority has set before the House and the nation. Extension of unemployment compensation is important, but 13 weeks isn't enough. Offering the unemployed an individual tax credit to buy health insurance on the open market isn't enough: average monthly premiums for COBRA range from \$220 for an individual to \$580 for a family; the standard unemployment benefits don't even begin to provide workers with the financial assistance they need to carry on their existing health insurance or buy new coverage in the private health insurance marketplace. The rope is just too short.

The people in my district who are out of work—and I don't think they are much different from people elsewhere in America—would far rather be paid for working at a useful job than being paid for not working. What they want most is a full time job paying a living wage with decent benefits, such as health insurance, and others that are provided in most collective bargaining agreements in the work place. We ought to be considering legislation that will invest in the nation's infrastructure and create those living wage, productive jobs instead of this mirage of a stimulus bill.

At the depths of the Great Depression, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt established the Works Progress Administration, the Civil Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration which together created jobs for over six million Americans, giving people real hope, lifting the nation out of depression and putting in place permanent improvements that elevated the quality of life throughout America.

In 1962, President John F. Kennedy signed into law the Accelerated Public Works Act, which invested over \$1 billion in community facilities, putting over 900,000 previously unemployed persons back to work by building water and sewer lines and sewage treatment plants, municipal buildings, fire halls, police stations, street lighting systems, sidewalks, streets, roads and bridges throughout the country.

In 1976, President Ford signed the Local Public Works Act and President Carter signed LPW 2, which invested a cumulative \$2 billion

in similar works throughout the country, creating jobs for over 1.5 million unemployed workers.

Today, we should do no less. The Democrats on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee have developed and introduced a bill to authorize \$50 billion for infrastructure investments to enhance the security of the nation's rail, environmental, highway, transit, aviation, maritime, water resources, and public buildings infrastructure. With leveraging features included in this legislation, the ten-year cost to the U.S. treasury would be less than \$32 billion.

The \$50 billion of investment initiated by our proposal would create more than 1.5 million jobs and generate \$90 billion of total economic activity.

Under the Democratic measure, H.R. 3166, preference would be given to infrastructure investments that provide enhanced security for the nation's transportation and environmental systems. Our bill specifically requires that the states, cities, transit authorities, airport authorities, etc., who would receive these funds, commit their investment to meeting security needs of their infrastructure systems and that the funds will be invested in ready-to-go projects to which those funds can be obligated within two years.

These investments create the private-sector jobs that build America, that provide the decent wages to buy homes, big-ticket household appliance, automobiles, and the other consumer goods that are the engines of growth for our economy, and which create permanent improvement for our cities and towns, for urban and rural America and improve the quality of life for all of our fellow citizens.

Yes, we ought to provide an extension of unemployment compensation and interim health insurance coverage for the nation's unemployed until they can get back to work; but we must create those jobs through enactment of the Rebuild America First Act to finance infrastructure renewal and security for the nation's transportation systems.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 3178, THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANTI-TERRORISM TOOLS FOR WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

HON. NICK SMITH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 3, 2002

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the bill H.R. 3178, which I am proud to co-sponsor. This important legislation will address research gaps and support the development of new and improved technologies and practices that will improve the security of our water infrastructure.

As we respond to the horrific attacks of September 11 militarily and diplomatically, we must be able to assess and reduce our vulnerabilities at home to make our nation more secure.

The safety and availability of our water supply is something that we tend to take for granted. Across the U.S., over 27 billion gallons of water are pumped each day. Some of our water infrastructure is extremely old and is subject to natural threats, accidents, and terrorists.