CEER-X- 134 BRIEF HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF NUCLEAR ENERGY IN PUERTO RICO TECHNOLOGY VS. POLITICS (1981-1987) CENTER FOR ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT RESEARCH

BRIEF HISTORY OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF NUCLEAR ENERGY IN PUERTO RICO TECHNOLOGY VS. POLITICS (1957-1981)

Prepared by: Lic. Justo E. Varela Dieppa, P.E. September 1981

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT - I wish to thank the cooperation received from Prof. Richard Brow, from the University Campus of Mayaguez, and Mr. Orlando Angleré, Chief of the Division of Environmental Studies and Quality Compatibility of the Electric Energy Authority. Likewise, I appreciate the comments on the draft of this work offered by Drs. Juan A. Sonnet, Jr. and Modesto Irfarte, from the Center for Energy and Environmental Studies of Puerto Rico, and Dr. Bonnet, son, for the opportunity he gave me to carry out this work. Last but not least, thanks to those who patiently typed the various drafts and the final work, Mrs. Sylvia Medina de Mercado, Ivette Diana de Vega, and Eva Oliver de Infante

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

During a historic speech given at the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 9, 1953, the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, outlined for the first time the "Atoms for Peace" plan, intended to spread the benefits of nuclear energy throughout the world. Today, despite the setbacks that arose in the 1970s, the plan has spread across the globe. As of

June 1981, approximately 250 reactors were commercially operational to generate electricity, in power plants of over 30 MW, with about 285 at some stage of planning or construction.

Etapa pre-operacional. Estas unidades tienen una capacidad neta en megavatios eléctricos de 408,098. (Ver Anexo 1). Sin embargo, el desarrollo pleno se ha visto manchado por movimientos antinucleares de todo tipo. Además, la legislación protectora del ambiente que empezó a surgir, especialmente en los Estados Unidos, desde 1969 (NEPA) también puso freno al desarrollo de esta nueva energía en la fase de su utilización para centrales generadoras de electricidad. A raíz del discurso del Presidente Eisenhower en el hemiciclo de las Naciones Unidas en 1953, el Congreso de los Estados Unidos enmendó la Ley de Energía Atómica de 1946 que no tenía disposiciones para el uso pacífico de esta fuente incalculable de energía. En 1954 se enmendó totalmente la ley para autorizar a la Comisión de Energía Atómica (CEA), establecida en 1986, adoptar reglas y estándares para implementar un procedimiento para licenciar la construcción y operación de instalaciones nucleares para usos pacíficos. ---Página Siguiente--- En el crecimiento del sistema regulador de la CEA pueden identificarse cuatro periodos de desarrollo. El primero comenzó con la aprobación de la Ley de Energía Atómica de 1946; el segundo con la promulgación de la Ley de 1954; el tercero con la emisión o concesión del primer permiso de construcción de un reactor de gran capacidad energética cerca de Monroe, Michigan (a la Power Reactor Development & Co.) en 1957; y el cuarto con la aprobación de la Ley de Reorganización Energética de 1974, que abolió la CEA y transfirió todas sus funciones de licenciamiento y regulaciones a la recién creada Comisión Reguladora Nuclear (CRN). El desarrollo de la energía nuclear en Puerto Rico ha sido gobernado tanto por la CEA como por la CRN. Es la función principal de la CEA (y de la CRN) el asegurarse que las actividades privadas relacionadas con la utilización de la energía nuclear se conduzcan dentro de un marco de seguridad razonable para que el público y los trabajadores no sean sometidos innecesariamente a riesgos.

Diariamente a los riesgos de la radioactividad, además de evitar que se contamine el ambiente. Precisamente esta preocupación es vital para que se apruebe la Ley de 1974 que abolió la CEA y creó la CRN, ya que para muchos las funciones promocionales y reguladoras de la antigua CEA eran inconsistentes. Esta preocupación toma gran auge en los comienzos de la década del 1970. Tan es así, que un ex-director de la CEA, el Dr. James R. Schlesinger, manifestó en el New York Times el 26 de noviembre de 1976, que la CER no seguiría actuando como un promotor de la energía nuclear y sí se convertiría en un "árbitro" del interés público. De hecho, la recién creada CRN no tiene funciones promocionales; estas fueron ubicadas en la Administración de Estudio y Desarrollo Energético (Energy Research & Development Administration).

El desarrollo de la energía nuclear en Puerto Rico en el campo de la generación eléctrica tuvo un buen comienzo, pero actualmente su estado es incierto en una isla que paradójicamente depende 100% del petróleo importado. Por otro lado, en el campo de la medicina y en la industria se ha venido utilizando con éxito la energía nuclear; actividad regulada por el Reglamento para el Control de la Radiación en Puerto Rico, promulgado en el 1972, bajo la supervisión de los Departamentos de Salud y del Trabajo y Recursos Humanos. Este reglamento fue establecido a la luz de la Ley #79 del 24 de junio de 1965, aprobada por nuestra Legislatura, bajo la cual el estado asume control sobre ciertos materiales y equipos radioactivos. Sin embargo, el primer contacto que tuvo la CEA con Puerto Rico fue a través del Centro Nuclear de Puerto Rico (CNPR). La Comisión de Energía Atómica fue instrumental en el establecimiento en Puerto Rico de dicho Centro y del primer reactor nuclear para producir energía eléctrica. Es a través del Comisionado James T.

Ramey, un gran amigo de Puerto Rico, y del entonces Director del Centro, Henry J. Gomberg, que nuestra Isla se viste de largo en el campo nuclear en toda América.

Tal es así, que se hace indispensable que la CEA establezca en Puerto Rico una oficina local (1957 a 1974), dirigida primeramente por el señor John I. Thomas y luego por los señores Floyd P. Trent y Perry Morgan. Estos fueron decididos y entusiastas colaboradores con las instituciones que se vieron envueltas en el desarrollo de la energía nuclear en nuestra isla, Centro Nuclear de Puerto. Posterior al discurso del Presidente Eisenhower en las Naciones Unidas en 1953, se celebró lo que se conoció como la Conferencia de Panamá del año 1956, en donde este insistió específicamente en que se hiciera algo "por acelerar los usos benéficos de la energía nuclear en todo el hemisferio". En enero de 1957 se celebró un simposio en la Universidad de Puerto Rico sobre las Aplicaciones Pacíficas de la Energía Atómica. Durante esta reunión, la necesidad de un centro nuclear que sirviera a Latinoamérica se hizo más evidente. Como resultado de este simposio y de la Conferencia de Panamá, la Comisión de Energía Atómica de los Estados Unidos estableció el Centro Nuclear de Puerto Rico, contando con la importante cooperación y ayuda de la Universidad de Puerto Rico, bajo los términos del Contrato #AT=(40-1)-1883 entre la UPR y la CEA. El Centro Nuclear fue concedido principalmente como una ayuda a las naciones latinoamericanas, a las que permitiría adquirir las técnicas esenciales para las actividades relacionadas con la energía nuclear, proveyéndolas de educación para graduados y de oportunidades de investigación. Además, la UPR participó en la preparación de operarios y supervisores para el primer reactor nuclear que se construyó en toda Latinoamérica para generar energía eléctrica, BONUS, ubicado en Rincón, Puerto Rico. Esta era una central nucleoeléctrica de tipo experimental de alrededor de 16,500 kilovatios de energía eléctrica. También ayudó en las investigaciones marinas y ambientales para los malogrados proyectos nucleoeléctricos de Aguirre y Arecibo. El CHPR fue establecido el 2 de octubre de 1957 y la.

Haber entrenado a 3,560 estudiantes y científicos de 41 diferentes países en tecnología y ciencia nuclear, medicina nuclear y radioterapia sanitaria, (Ver Anexo 3). De estos, 694 eran extranjeros, 2,866 ciudadanos americanos (la gran mayoría puertorriqueños). De hecho, el único récord que distingue a los puertorriqueños de los demás ciudadanos americanos disponible a este escritor, nos indica que entre 1970 y 1976 de 1,328 ciudadanos americanos; 1,248 fueron puertorriqueños. (Ver Anexo 4) Otro hecho significante de la importancia de este Centro y lo que representaba, fue que en sus primeros 10 años su staff aumentó de 43 a 300, incluyendo 80 científicos. (Ver Anexo 5). Al momento del cierre, su Senior Staff era de 140. (Ver Anexo 6). Durante sus primeros 18 años de vida, el Centro tuvo un promedio de 185 estudiantes por año, y en su último año su matrícula era de 239 (Ver Anexo 7); siendo el 1974 su año de mayor matrícula en su historia, 365. Durante sus últimos cinco años el Centro adiestró el 36% de su matrícula total de 19 años. Todo esto parece apuntar hacia el hecho de que el CHPR no había perdido importancia ni interés entre la comunidad científica al momento de su cierre. El Centro produjo en su historia alrededor de 766 publicaciones científicas, siendo el año 1970 el más productivo con 98 (Ver Anexo 8); un promedio de 40 por año. Su staff presentó alrededor de 643 papeles científicos en reuniones científicas alrededor del mundo, siendo el año más productivo el 1966 con 76 (Ver Anexo 9); un promedio de 34 por año. Todo este acervo científico en el campo de la energía nuclear y sus campos relacionados habla muy bien de los logros del Centro. Ante este cuadro nadie puede sostener que el interés en la energía nuclear había decaído, al menos desde el punto de vista científico. Por otro lado, el CNPR tuvo la responsabilidad de conducir un programa de investigaciones científicas en

biología, química y física como parte de la exhibición Átomos en Acción de la Comisión de Energía.

Fluviales (AFF) llevó a cabo estudios y diseños preliminares sobre BONUS bajo el contrato AT(40-1)2484, otorgado en el año 1958. Dichos estudios fueron terminados el 30 de noviembre de 1959 y el 21 de diciembre de ese mismo año. Fueron publicados en diciembre de 1959 y enero de 1960, respectivamente. La decisión relacionada con el permiso de construcción fue emitida por la CEA el 28 de junio de 1960, siendo final y firme el 19 de julio de 1960. (Ver Anexo 14) La Central recibió el Permiso de Operación No. DPRA-4, otorgado por la CER, a principios de 1964. El 13 de abril de 1968 se llevó el reactor a un estado de criticidad inicial, el 15 de septiembre de 1965 el reactor fue llevado a su potencia térmica máxima, 50 megavatios, con todo el vapor desviado hacia el condensador. El día 20 del mismo mes se cargó la turbina a 16 megavatios eléctricos, la capacidad de diseño de la central.

---Página Siguiente---

Durante el período del 10 de noviembre a 9 de diciembre de 1965, se operó la central a su potencia completa como demostración. El período de arranque terminó el 19 de diciembre del mismo año. (Ver Anexo 15). Entró en operación comercial en marzo de 1966. La Central operó hasta julio de 1967, cuando finalmente fue decomisada en el año 1970 por razones económicas, según se señala más adelante. El proceso de decomisión se había iniciado el 11 de agosto de 1959, al recibir el permiso final de la CEA, (Ver Anexo 16) Esta fue la primera aventura nuclear de la AFF, y el primer reactor nuclear instalado en Latinoamérica para generar energía eléctrica. Es decir, BONUS fue la primera central nucleoeléctrica de Latinoamérica. El tipo de reactor utilizado era uno de dos que fueron instalados en esa época en el mundo occidental. Consistió de un reactor nuclear de agua hirviente (boiling water reactor) con sobrecalentador nuclear de vapor integral. La Central tenía una capacidad generatriz de 16,500 kilovatios eléctricos. Era un programa conjunto (Joint venture) de la CEA y la entonces Autoridad de las Fuentes Fluviales, hoy Autoridad de Energía.

Eléctrica, siendo operado por esta Gitina en un plano de investigación por un espacio de tres años (1964-1967). Lo que se investigó fue la técnica de producir vapor sobre calentado por métodos nucleares, propósito que fue cabalmente cumplido. Una vez demostrada la viabilidad de esta técnica, la Comisión de Energía Atómica desistió de seguir costeando la operación de la misma y se le ofreció a la Autoridad. La AFF decidió no operar comercialmente la misma debido a que la pequeña capacidad de la central (16.5 Me) la hacía económicamente inoperable en su sistema.

Para la operación de dicha central se adiestraron alrededor de 50 técnicos especializados en el campo nuclear en distintas capacidades (incluyendo ingenieros), la gran mayoría en el Centro Nuclear de Puerto Rico. Este proyecto inició un proceso para dotar a Puerto Rico de una central nucleo-eléctrica comercialmente viable. Proceso que no se ha culminado y parece que finalmente decaerá. Es bueno señalar que varios científicos e ingenieros puertorriqueños y norteamericanos (Dr. Modesto Iriarte, Dr. Juan A. Bonnet, Jr., Ing. Angel J. Lizasoain, Ing. Julio Hernández Fragoso, Sr. James T. Ramey, Dr. Henry J. Gomberg, Sr. Sol Luis Descartes, Ing. Rafael V. Urrutia, Dr. Ismael Almodovar, entre otros), al igual que los ex-gobernadores Luis Muñoz Marín (q.e.p.d.) y

Luis A. Ferré, visualizaron desde el 1960 la necesidad que tenía Puerto Rico de independizarse del petróleo importado (13 años antes de la crisis del 1973), y vieron en la incalculable energía atómica la solución de nuestro desarrollo económico. La Autoridad de las Fuentes Fluviales (hoy Autoridad de Energía Eléctrica) fue pionera, junto al Centro Nuclear de Puerto Rico de ese esfuerzo. Sin embargo, es bueno señalar que la AEE, por diversas razones, no considera seriamente al presente la alternativa nuclear entre las posibilidades que tiene Puerto Rico para solucionar su dilema energético. Sin embargo, en San Luis Obispo, California, la Pacific Gas & Electric, la corporación.

"Bravida, la más grande de la nación de generación eléctrica, está a punto de inaugurar una central nucleoeléctrica (Cañón del Diablo); la séptima que entraría en operaciones desde el incidente de la Isla Three Miles. (Ver Anexo 17). Todo esto ocurre en el país donde más abunda el carbón.

Uno en busca de un lugar. Conociendo que la Central BOWS no ofrece posibilidades de operación comercial, la AFF inició una serie de estudios geológicos, hidrológicos y ambientales desde el 1963 alrededor de la Isla para buscar posibles lugares de ubicación para centrales nucleoeléctricas y fósiles. Los primeros estudios (1962-1967) se realizaron en Tortuguero (Manatí), Palo Seco (Toa Baja) y Aguirre (Guayama), luego en Punta Higuera (Rincón) y Yabucoa. (Ver Anexos 18 y 19). En una ocasión, entre 1973-1975, la AFF llegó a someter 15 posibles lugares para la construcción de centrales fósiles a la Junta de Calidad Ambiental de Puerto Rico. (Ver Anexo 20). Posteriormente esto se redujo a cinco (5) por motivos ambientales, geológicos, agrícolas, hidrológicos y turísticos. Luego, de estos fueron establecidos varios para ubicación de centrales nucleoeléctricas.

Específicamente, la AFF sometió a la Junta de Planificación de Puerto Rico, el 19 de septiembre de 1963, una consulta de ubicación para una central nucleoeléctrica al oeste de la Laguna Tortuguero (Barrio Tierras Nuevas Salientes) en la municipalidad de Manatí. Esto se hizo en paralelo con los estudios antes mencionados. El 14 de junio de 1965 se le sometió a la JP información adicional. El 17 de marzo de 1965 se sometió a la JP los planos de mensura de las fincas concernidas y se solicitó permiso para adquisición de terreno. El 11 de octubre de 1966 se le volvió a notificar a la JP que la AFF seguía considerando seriamente los terrenos de Tortuguero para el establecimiento de una central nucleoeléctrica. (Ver Anexo 21). Eran los primeros pasos de un sueño que hasta ahora parece irrealizable.

El 21 de noviembre de 1966 se celebró en Puerto"

Rico tuvo una audiencia ideal para la ubicación de un reactor nuclear de escala comercial para generar energía eléctrica. La misma se celebró en el Municipio de Manatí. Se describió el proyecto y se le dio énfasis al tópico de seguridad. No hubo gran oposición. El 27 de febrero de 1967 se celebró una segunda audiencia pública. A la misma compareció el primer grupo organizado que se oponía a dicha ubicación, el cual presentó al señor Adolph J. Ackerman, de Madison, Wisconsin, como su consultor en asuntos nucleares. Más adelante se descubrió que este señor era un lego en la materia. (Ver Anejo 22). A raíz de esa audiencia pública, el Club Exchange de Manatí emitió una resolución, fechada el 14 de marzo de 1967, resolviendo ofrecer el respaldo unánime al establecimiento de la central nuclear bajo consideración. (Ver Anejo 23). Esta es la primera acción concertada de un grupo a favor de una central nuclear de que tenemos conocimiento en Puerto

Rico. Dicha consulta (64-136C) fue recomendada favorablemente el 15 de mayo de 1967 (Informe #67-C-160) por la Junta de Planificación de Puerto Rico. (Ver Anejo 24). La Autoridad adquirió por expropiación forzosa cerca de 500 cuerdas de terrenos en el área de Tortuguero. Sin embargo, la ubicación de dicha central no se viabilizó. Entre las razones para descartar dicho lugar estuvo la posterior centralización de industrias pesadas, consumidoras de grandes bloques de energía, a ser localizadas en la Costa Sur y la conveniencia de que la generación eléctrica se ubicara cerca de estos centros. Simultáneamente grupos ambientales continuaron presionando para que el área de La Laguna Tortuguero fuera convertida en santuario ecológico. Sin embargo, es bueno señalar que dicho lugar fue recomendado favorablemente por el Advisory Committee for Reactor Safeguards (grupo de científicos que le hacían recomendaciones a la Comisión de Energía Atómica), desde el punto de vista geológico. A la luz de lo anterior, y teniendo conocimiento de ese problema, la

La Autoridad de Fuentes Fluviales (AFF) ya ha iniciado planes para ubicar un complejo generatriz en el área de Aguirre. A tales efectos, compareció a una audiencia pública en agosto de 1966 en el Municipio de Salinas (3 meses antes de la que se celebró en Manatí) que celebró la Junta de Planificación (JP) para considerar la viabilidad en términos generales del establecimiento de una central nuclear eléctrica. Más tarde, la AFF presentó la solicitud #67-1225-P para que se le autorizara adquirir tierra y servidumbre de paso para esos propósitos. Dicha solicitud fue aprobada por la JP el 24 de mayo de 1967, 9 días después de haber recomendado favorablemente la ubicación de una central nuclear eléctrica en Tortuguero. (Ver Anexo 25). Por las razones que señalaremos más adelante, la central nuclear eléctrica no se materializó tampoco en Aguirre a pesar de que el proyecto estuvo muy adelantado. Mientras tanto, la Autoridad continuó con sus investigaciones geológicas, hidrológicas y ambientales alrededor de la isla, con excepción de un área desde el este del Municipio de Dorado hasta el sector Las Cabezas en Fajardo, y un área entre Aguirre y Ponce. Estas dos áreas fueron excluidas, la primera por ser una de alto interés turístico y alta densidad poblacional, y la segunda por ya existir información. En el 1973 la información preliminar disponible apuntaba hacia la Costa Norte entre Tortuguero y Arecibo como la de mayor potencialidad. (Ver Anexo 26). Entre los sectores estudiados se encontraban Punta Cerro Gordo (Dorado), Río Cibuco (Vega Baja), Punta Chivato (Manatí), Tortuguero (Manatí), Islote (Arecibo), el área de Quebradillas, Quebrada del Toro (Isabela), Cabo Mala Pascua (Patillas), Punta Verraco (Guánica), Morrillos (Cabo Rojo), Rincón y Aguadilla. Finalmente se recomendaron tres sectores: Tortuguero (el que había sido aprobado en 1967), Islote y Punta Chivato. Ya en estos momentos, el factor principal era ecológico y geológico. Islote fue seleccionado y fue recomendado por la Comisión Reguladora Nuclear desde el punto de vista.

Ambiental (siendo de hecho el único lugar así aprobado en P.R.) en 1976, (Ver Anejo 27). Según se revelará más adelante, Islote probó ser la aparente tumba del desarrollo de la energía nuclear para generar electricidad comercialmente en Puerto Rico. De hecho, esta unidad (o unidades) nuclear experimentó una serie de aplazamientos por diferentes razones, hasta que se pospuso indefinidamente en 1976, 1981 y 1985; entre las razones podríamos mencionar problemas de financiamiento, aumento de costos y consideraciones políticas. Aguirre e Islote: ¿Fracasos o víctimas? Aguirre, un poblado rural del Municipio de Salinas, dentro del Distrito de Guayana, (específicamente el Barrio Jobos) tuvo la primera oportunidad seria de convertirse en uno de los primeros lugares en Latinoamérica en tener una central nuclear eléctrica de una capacidad intermedia (500 MWe) de tipo comercial para el 1976. Pensando en grande, en 1968 la Asamblea Legislativa de Puerto Rico asignó $200,000.00 para ser pareados por la CEA para llevar a cabo un estudio conducente al establecimiento de un centro agro-industrial de energía (Agro-Industrial Nuclear Energy Complex), que también se conoció como NUPLEK (Nuclear Complex). (Ver Anejo

28). El mismo estaba formado por 22 estructuras principales y sus instalaciones incluyendo plantas desalinizadoras (para tratar de resolver parcialmente el problema de las sequías en la Región Sur), plantas para recobrar sal, refinerías, plantas químicas satélites, planta de aluminio, finca agrícola experimental, aeropuerto para aviones livianos y un área para una futura expansión industrial. Dicho estudio no contó con los aumentos descomunales en el precio del petróleo que comenzaron en el año 1969 e hicieron crisis en 1973. Habiéndose concluido el estudio en 1969, estos acontecimientos invalidaron de facto el mismo. Además, fue precisamente en el año 1969 que se comenzó el movimiento ambientalista en los Estados Unidos y Puerto Rico, con la aprobación del National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Com

Como consecuencia de este movimiento, la Bahía de Jobos (Aguirre), donde se había recomendado establecer NUPLEX, fue posteriormente declarada una área ecológicamente delicada. El tipo de reactor nuclear que se planeaba construir era el de agua presurizada (PWR). Por otro lado, el 26 de junio de 1968, un Comité Especial nombrado por el Director Ejecutivo Interino de la AEE para llevar a cabo una evaluación económica sobre la decisión entre unidades fósiles o unidades nucleares, rinde un informe titulado Comité Especial sobre la Selección de Unidades Generadoras para 1975 y 1976. Dicho Comité recomendó en noviembre de 1968 al Director Ejecutivo Interino la construcción de una Unidad E641 para operación en 1976, (Ver Anexo 29). En enero de 1969, en una reunión en La Fortaleza, mansión ejecutiva de Puerto Rico, entre el recién electo gobernador ingeniero Luis A. Ferré, el Director Ejecutivo de la Autoridad ingeniero Félix Cordova Diaz, el Sr. James T. Raney, Comisionado de la CEA, y el Dr. Modesto Iriarte, de la Autoridad, y otros, el entonces gobernador de Puerto Rico, ingeniero Luis A. Ferré, dio autorización al Director Ejecutivo de la AEE para que procediera a considerar seriamente la alternativa nuclear. Al señor Gobernador le preocupaba la total dependencia en el petróleo, especialmente ante lo que se empezaba a percibir en el mercado de éste. Este nuevo enfoque ante las alzas aceleradas en el costo del petróleo, que no se consideraron en los estudios anteriores, dio una gran ventaja a la alternativa nuclear en los estudios de planificación. El decidido respaldo del entonces Gobernador Ferré fue instrumental para considerar positivamente la instalación de una central nucleoeléctrica que entraría en operación comercial para enero de 1976. Ya para esta fecha la Autoridad había planificado la construcción de dos unidades fósiles, utilizando petróleo, de 460 MW cada una en Aguirre. Este lugar fue seleccionado debido a la actividad industrial que se esperaba que se desarrollaría en el área.

La actividad del ave 1 se quedó muy corta. Posteriormente, se añadieron dos unidades de gas (1972) de 40 W y, finalmente, dos unidades de ciclo combinado de 250 W cada una. La Declaración de Impacto Ambiental para el desarrollo de Aguirre fue sometida a la Junta de Calidad Ambiental el 21 de abril del año actual. Para abaratar los costos de construcción de la futura central nuclear, la Autoridad decidió ubicarla en Aguirre donde existiría la infraestructura necesaria, tales como centro de transmisión, líneas eléctricas, carreteras, almacenes y otros. Se confió en el juicio de los entonces consultores de la AFF en materia geológica y sísmica, quienes asumieron que la falla geológica en Aguirre podía probarse que era inactiva. Así se abandonó el lugar del área de Tortuguero, además de por las razones ya expresadas. Esto luego resultó ser un gran error y quizás el punto que marcó decididamente la final cancelación del proyecto nuclear. De haberse seleccionado el área de Tortuguero creemos que el proyecto se hubiera llevado a feliz término. Esta había sido la intención original el 19 de julio de 1972, la CER comenzó a poner reparos en la data geológica presentada. Según ellos, la misma no probaba que una falla geológica cerca del lugar de la ubicación del reactor estaba inactiva, y que probar dicha inactividad era sumamente difícil. (Inactivo quería decir que la falla no había sufrido ningún desplazamiento

durante los últimos 35,000 años y no más de un desplazamiento en los últimos 500,000 años). Este problema tenía una solución ingenieril: diseños para terremotos de magnitudes elevadas. Pero el costo involucrado era muy alto. Por tal razón, desde el 10 de enero de 1973 se comenzó a hablar sobre la necesidad de mover las unidades nucleares a otros lugares. Para agosto de 1972 la Autoridad se vio forzada a paralizar indefinidamente la construcción de dicha unidad debido a este problema. Se volvió a sugerir la utilización del lugar disponible en Tortuguero, aún cuando había que comenzar de nuevo todo el proceso.

Proceso de aprobación del lugar. Este cambio trajo la posposición de la unidad nuclear de 1976 a 1981. Los estudios que se habían venido realizando indicaban una posible faja de terreno apropiado para la ubicación de unidades nucleares entre el este de Arecibo y el oeste de Tortuguero, a pesar de que mapas geológicos indicaban la posibilidad de la existencia de una falla menor conocida como Briggs Fault a lo largo del Cato Tiburones. El 25 de junio de 1973, la Autoridad decidió concentrar sus esfuerzos y estudios geológicos en Tortuguero e Islote (Arecibo). Finalmente, los estudios geológicos, ambientales y económicos determinaron que el lugar más apropiado desde el punto geosísmico era cualquier punto en la Costa Norte localizado entre Arecibo y Dorado. Se seleccionó el área de Islote del Municipio de Arecibo como la más apropiada, incluyendo el aspecto ambiental y social. Este lugar satisfacía los criterios de selección de lugares (site selection) tanto de la nueva Comisión Reguladora Nuclear (CRN), como de la vieja Comisión de Energía Atómica. Los hallazgos de este estudio fueron discutidos con el personal del CEA. Posteriormente, la Autoridad radicó ante la nueva CRN el Informe Preliminar de Análisis de Seguridad y el Informe Ambiental el 26 de septiembre de 1974; los mismos fueron aceptados oficialmente por la CRN el 27 de enero de 1975. Estos documentos son los que conducen esencialmente al permiso de construcción. Como consecuencia del embargo petrolero del 1973, las realidades económicas y financieras por las que atravesaba la Autoridad y la crisis recesionaria que afectaba a Puerto Rico en el 1975, en adición a la reducción en la demanda de energía (de 16.2% en el año fiscal 1972-1973 a 1.7% en el año fiscal 1974-1975), y los estimados de proyecciones de demanda eléctrica, hicieron posponer la posible construcción de la unidad nuclear en la Isla del 1981 al 1985. Por tal razón, el 10 de agosto de 1978 se decidió no continuar con aquella parte del.

Proceso de licenciamiento que involucraba las vistas públicas sobre asuntos ambientales y la comparecencia ante el Advisory Committee for Reactor Safeguards en relación al Informe de Evaluación de Seguridad. Si se decidía continuar con los esfuerzos para que la CR aprobara finalmente a Islote como un lugar apropiado para unidades nucleares de cierto tipo y capacidad en todos sus aspectos. Ya en septiembre de 1975, la CRU le había dado el visto bueno a las medidas de seguridad de la propuesta central nuclear. Más adelante, el 11 de septiembre de 1976, la CRU determinó en el Borrador de Declaración de Impacto Ambiental que el propuesto Barrio Islote era apropiado para el establecimiento de una central de energía nuclear, desde este punto. (Ver Anejo 30). Por otro lado, a principios del año 1976, y debido a las posposiciones de 1976 a 1985, la Autoridad decidió vender todo el equipo de la central nuclear. No se pudo vender y está almacenado en Aguirre. Eventualmente la construcción de la central fue pospuesta indefinidamente, el equipo almacenado en Aguirre y obsoleto, y los líderes políticos de todos los partidos en contra de la construcción de dicha central en el futuro previsible (Ver Anejo 31). La única excepción siempre lo ha sido el ex-Gobernador Luis A. Ferré, quien es ingeniero técnico, y anteriormente el ex-Gobernador Luis Muñoz Marín (q.e.p.d.), quien dio instrucciones al Sr. Sol Luis Descartes, ex-Director Ejecutivo de la AFF, para iniciar el programa nuclear en la AFF (hoy Autoridad de Energía Eléctrica). El ex-Gobernador Roberto Sánchez Vilella, quien también es

ingeniero civil, no se ha manifestado últimamente. Pero tanto bajo su presidencia en la Junta de Gobierno de la AFF como en su término en la Gobernación (1966-1968), el programa nuclear de la Autoridad se desarrolló. Tanto el Gobernador Carlos Romero Barceló, como el ex-Gobernador Rafael Hernández Colón y los líderes independentistas Rubén Berríos y Juan Mari Bras, que son abogados, se han manifestado en

Contra la energía nuclear. Todo, a pesar de que los asesores científicos e ingenieros de las últimas 405 administraciones 1972-1960 han respaldado la energía nuclear. Todo el proceso de licenciamiento fue detenido en 1979. Es bueno señalar que la organización privada Misión Industrial, Inc. lleva el peso principal de la oposición nuclear, tanto en el Proyecto de Aguirre como el de Islote. Su intervención fue efectiva y su voz fue escuchada con detenimiento y sus argumentos considerados con mucho cuidado. Por otro lado, tanto el Colegio de Ingenieros y Agrimensores y el Colegio de Químicos de Puerto Rico han respaldado consistentemente la opción nuclear. Lo mismo hizo el National Academy of Sciences en su informe 'Energy in Puerto Rico's Future', publicado en forma final en 1980; aunque considera que por razones de capacidad del sistema eléctrico y la demanda pronosticada, una central nucleoeléctrica no es viable, por lo menos durante los próximos 20 años, a menos que se desarrolle una unidad nuclear pequeña que sea económicamente viable. Similar posición han tomado la mayor parte de los ex-directores ejecutivos de la Autoridad de Energía Eléctrica. Esta posición contrasta con el hecho innegable que la Autoridad tiene en operación dos unidades de 460 Mw cada una y dos unidades de 425 Mw cada una, para las cuales se tienen que proveer las correspondientes medidas de reserva y estabilidad dinámica, a menos que la Autoridad decida descartarlas en el futuro lo cual resulta ilógico. El Centro de Estudios Energéticos y Ambientales de Puerto Rico, como señalamos al comienzo de este escrito, es el sucesor del Centro Nuclear de Puerto Rico. Inició operaciones el 1ro. de julio de 1976 y surge con el cambio de prioridades ocurrido con la Ley 93-438 que creó la Administración de Estudios y Desarrollos Energéticos (ERDA) en 1975. Se reorientan los programas para hacerle frente a la crisis energética, especialmente en relación.

Con el impacto ambiental resultante de tecnologías energéticas y usos energéticos. Además, se reorientan las investigaciones hacia el uso directo de la energía solar e indirectamente por medio de la conversión océano-termal. La CEEA se dirige principalmente a las ciencias ambientales; medicina, conservación de energía; ciencia o ingeniería solar, incluyendo conversión océano-termal; y desarrollo e investigación de materiales. También estudia otras fuentes de energía; biomasa y bioconversión. La energía nuclear ha sido totalmente relegada. En el "Integrated Program Plan for UPR/CEER FY 1977-82" que fue preparado en abril de 1977 y corregido posteriormente (CEER-A-63) en 1980, nos dice que dicho Centro está comprendido de cinco divisiones principales: a) Solar; b) OTEC; c) Ecología Marina; d) Ecología Terrestre y e) Biomasa. El presupuesto sugerido para ese programa de cinco años elimina totalmente en 1979 los programas de Medicina Nuclear e Ingeniería Nuclear. (Ver Anexo 32) Por otro lado, en el propuesto Plan de Cinco Años (1982-1986), el Centro incluyó un programa nuclear, pero solo le asigna el 0.6% del presupuesto total para esos cinco años; y el mismo va mayormente dirigido a la fusión nuclear (92%). (Ver Anexo 13). Solo el 6% del presupuesto se asigna a educación y adiestramiento. Con este cuadro la energía nuclear parece destinada a desaparecer del panorama puertorriqueño, especialmente en el campo de la energía eléctrica. Parece extraño que siendo la energía nuclear una fuente de energía disponible se haya relegado al plano que se encuentra hoy día. En los informes anuales del CEEA (1979-1980) nada encontramos sobre energía nuclear. Sin embargo, el Informe Anual de 1980 (p. 29) hace mención de un estudio realizado sobre las necesidades energéticas de Puerto Rico hasta el año 2020 y el costo de las diferentes alternativas,

lo cual podemos apreciar concluye gráficamente que la alternativa nuclear es la más económica. (Ver Anexo 32). Pero el informe solo destaca el hecho.

La biomasa representa una solución a corto plazo y OTEC para la próxima década, a pesar de que este último se equipara con la energía nuclear en el año 2020. Por otro lado, el Centro continúa su proliferación de publicaciones científicas (ninguna nuclear) con 34 en 1979 y 53 en 1981. Pero algo si tenemos claro, que el Centro tiene la capacidad científica para involucrarse más en el campo nuclear.

Estado Actual de la Energía Nuclear

Aunque parezca paradójico, desde el embargo petrolero de 1973, la energía nuclear para generar electricidad comenzó a decaer tanto en los Estados Unidos como en Puerto Rico. Lo contrario ocurrió en Europa y Japón, y en algunos países latinoamericanos. La legislación ambiental, la inflación y la recesión causada por el problema petrolero y la disminución en el consumo de electricidad fueron factores para esta declinación en el interés en centrales nucleoeléctricas.

Actualmente hay cuatro veces más unidades nucleares planificadas o bajo construcción fuera de los Estados Unidos que en este país (Business Week: agosto 31, 1981; p. 102). (Ver Anexo 33). Por otro lado, en los Estados Unidos se han cancelado 100 centrales nucleoeléctricas desde 1975, 16 en 1980 (Business Week, supra). Este hecho, junto al hecho de que las exportaciones de la industria nuclear han disminuido de 83 (1958-1975) a 27 (1975-1981), tienen al borde de la muerte a esta industria.

El Gobierno Federal cambió su enfoque en el programa energético a transformar la CEA en la Administración de Estudios e Investigaciones Energéticos en 1975. Más adelante, el Presidente de los Estados Unidos, Jimmy Carter, se declaró en contra del establecimiento de nuevas unidades nucleares. Pero aparentemente el Presidente Ronald Reagan, de los Estados Unidos, tiene intenciones de revivir el programa nuclear.

Como señalamos anteriormente, en Puerto Rico la energía nuclear y su uso para generar electricidad parece estar muerta. Durante los últimos años, la AEE (antes AFF) ha venido realizando estudios y gestiones para... [El texto se corta aquí y necesita más información para continuar].

Las proyecciones de demanda y energía indican que la capacidad actual de la AEE es suficiente para satisfacer la demanda hasta el 1995. Este hecho y la oposición en el liderato político del país hace remotamente posible el establecimiento de una unidad nuclear en Puerto Rico durante el resto del presente siglo. No se ha considerado la posibilidad de sustituir las unidades convencionales que ya han pasado o pasarán su vida útil por unidades nucleares para economizar a largo plazo los gastos de combustible. Sin embargo, sí se piensa hacer con unidades de carbón. Esperamos que el simposio sobre energía nuclear que se celebrará en Puerto Rico durante el mes de noviembre de 1981 traiga mayor luz sobre este asunto.

A lo largo de este escrito nos hemos podido percatar que la problemática de la energía nuclear en Puerto Rico nos presenta estas dos vertientes: política y tecnología. Los aspectos técnicos tienen

soluciones científicas. En dos ocasiones la Comisión de Energía Atómica y la Comisión Reguladora Nuclear han aprobado preliminarmente, desde el punto de vista ambiental, tres lugares en Puerto Rico (Tortuguero, Aguirre e Islote). El problema sísmico es uno de diseño y económico. Por ejemplo, en California, un área de alta intensidad sísmica, se han establecido centrales nucleoeléctricas. La última tan reciente como septiembre de 1981, la Central Nuclear Cañón del Diablo, en San Luis Obispo. De hecho, durante un fuerte movimiento telúrico en años recientes, fue una central nuclear la única que se mantuvo operando en un sector de California. Cañón del Diablo es la séptima central nucleoeléctrica que inicia operaciones desde el incidente de Three Miles Island.

El problema de la disposición de desperdicios radioactivos no debe constituir preocupación para Puerto Rico. Estos desperdicios se almacenan en lugares escogidos en los Estados Unidos. Además, se sigue estudiando e investigando nuevos métodos de disposición. Por otro lado, en octubre de 1977 el Presidente Carter, de los EE.UU.

Anunció que el Gobierno Federal almacenaría los combustibles usados de centrales nucleares eléctricas comerciales por una tasa de almacenaje sencilla, para aliviar la presión que tienen las centrales por carecer de espacio suficiente mientras continúa la investigación. El aspecto de seguridad y ambiental ha sido solucionado en más de una ocasión. En cuanto a esto, el incidente de Three Mile Island tiene muchos puntos positivos. Sin embargo, los políticos siguen trayendo argumentos que ya la tecnología ha resuelto o que ni siquiera atañen a Puerto Rico, o que ya fueron evaluados por las agencias concernidas. Por último, es bueno señalar que existe un aspecto sumamente importante en el caso de Puerto Rico: el económico. Una decisión nuclear en nuestra isla más que tomar en consideración asuntos técnicos o políticos, tiene que tomar en consideración el impacto económico. Este resume toda nuestra problemática. Si consideramos que los atrasos de los proyectos de Aguirre e Islote hicieron que los mismos llegaran a niveles de costo prohibitivos y que la postergación de los mismos le ha costado al pueblo de Puerto Rico cerca de $100 millones anuales, tenemos que concluir forzosamente que el aspecto económico tiene suma importancia en nuestra isla. ¿Nos preguntamos si la solución a toda esta problemática político-económico-tecnológica sería consultar a nuestro pueblo directamente, después de una orientación de los pros y los contras? Muchos estados de los Estados Unidos y países europeos han recurrido a este mecanismo para auscultar el verdadero sentir de los realmente afectados: los consumidores.

Anexo 2: Lista mundial de plantas de energía nuclear operables, en construcción o en pedido (30 MWe y más) a partir del 30 de junio de 1981.

Se necesita más información para completar la traducción.

The text seems to be highly disjointed, scrambled, and consists of various fragments that don't form coherent sentences or paragraphs. It appears to be discussing nuclear power plants, surveys, and different countries but without proper context or order. Due to the serious lack of context and coherent structure, it's impossible to correct it in a meaningful way. Could you provide the correct version, or at least more context or information, so I can assist you better?

I'm sorry, but the provided text seems to be incoherent and scrambled. It's difficult to provide a

meaningful correction without a clearer understanding of the intended message. Could you please provide more context or a clearer text?

I'm sorry, but the text you provided seems to be a mix of random words and letters. It's not clear what the original message was supposed to be. Could you provide additional context or a clearer version of the text?

I'm sorry, but the text provided is too garbled and lacks enough context for me to fix it. Could you please provide a clearer version or more details?

I'm sorry, but the text provided is too garbled and lacks context for me to effectively fix it. Could you provide additional context or a clearer version of the text?

I'm sorry, but the text you've provided is unclear and appears to be a random mixture of letters and symbols. Could you please provide more context or a clearer version of the text so I can better assist you?

I'm sorry, but your text seems to be scrambled and doesn't make sense. If you could provide clearer information, I would be more than happy to assist you.

The text appears to be quite scrambled and contains many typos, numbers and abbreviations that are difficult to interpret without context. I can only correct the obvious errors. Here is my best attempt:

The Southern facilities are excellent. One of PRI's two main facilities is at the University's Mayaguez campus on the west coast. Murray St. has three reactors (one pool-type research reactor and two training reactors), a subcritical assembly, a 1k MeV neutron generator, neutron spectrometers, a laboratory for work with high and low-level radioactivity, a large gun facility, a chemistry laboratory, and separate buildings for plant sciences, nuclear engineering and marine biology. The marine biology program has a 100-ton oceanographic research vessel, fully equipped with laboratories.

The other main facility is at the new Medical Center in Rio Piedras, on the outskirts of San Juan. The Bio-Medical building in Rio Piedras is equipped for research in several fields. Irradiation facilities include a cobalt-60 teletherapy unit, a 400 KVP X-ray therapy unit, and a cobalt-60 irradiator. An animal house next door is stocked with colonies of mice and snails for experimental use. A solid-state physics laboratory is located at the University's College of Natural Sciences in Rio Piedras; terrestrial ecology laboratories are located in the Luquillo National Forest.

The Nuclear Center's academic program is closely integrated with the master's programs of the UPR in the physical and life sciences, agriculture, and engineering. Students enroll at the University and receive academic credit through the corresponding University department. Their professors are scientists who have joint appointments at both PRNC and the University. Inroads are also being made at the doctoral level. New doctoral programs are now offered in biochemistry, microbiology, and physiology; proposals for programs in physical sciences and chemistry are under study. PRNC also gives non-credit training courses and provides facilities.

SENIOR STAFF

1. Sito Tore
2. Roos Mane
3. Satan Onsiony
4. Cme Pg
5. Rainy Acct
6. Era Ex
7. Lig Benen
8. Cl Soni
9. Tt Compo
10. Un Ery
11. Sn Maes
12. Sera of As
13. Ane Oa
14. Nvr of Rr
15. Rizo Da
16. See of Ton
17. Anejo 6
18. Sere Ation
19. Tnpy Etaton

The text appears to have a significant amount of errors and is not coherent. Some parts seem to be in a different language or code, and other parts appear to be random series of numbers and letters.

However, I can attempt to correct the parts that are in English:

Attachment 13 'PROPOSED FIVE YEAR (1982-86) PLAN SUMMARY ‘The proposed five-year plan (1982-86) for the development of alternative energy sources is subdivided into thirteen (13) main subject areas:

1. Ore
2. Biomass
3. Bioconversion
4. Fossil Fuels Research
5. Solar Program
6. Ecology Programs
7. Environmental Health
8. Materials Development
9. Integrated Technological Assessment

10. Nuclear Program
11. Transportation and Conservation
12. Public Awareness
13. International Programs

Summary Table S-1 "Total Funding Requirements for Proposed Five Year Plan" illustrates the funding level requirements for each subject program. Total funding requirements average out approximately $1347 million per year. This is approximately 3-4 times the average level of CEER funding existing during the last two or three years.

Unfortunately, the rest of the text is too garbled to be deciphered or corrected.

The corrected text:

Two major explanations for the increase in the "IIA over 7" budget are that the proposed program involves costlier development and demonstration programs compared to previous less expensive programs, which were aimed at developing baseline information data. 42% of the total budget goes towards "Development" and only 30% to "Basic Research." This latter requirement is vitally needed for the development of additional baseline information. Demonstration programs account for 22% of the budget while training and education accounts for less than 6%. No meaningful energy process could be developed without funding comparable to the amount indicated in Summary Table S-1.

OTEC is the largest budgeted program (21.52%) followed by Biomass (19.42%). Geology, which interfaces with several of the energy programs, ranks third in budgeting (18.62%) followed by Solar (9.12%). Summary Table S-2, "Total Program Personnel Distribution," illustrates the total manpower requirements by classifications for all programs. For detailed information on manpower requirements per program, see the corresponding Table 2 under the respective program section.

The total maximum projected personnel requirements for the programs vary between 297-335. The current CEER total personnel is slightly under 200, indicating an approximate growth of 77% is needed to handle all programs. CEER believes that there are sufficient physical facilities available. After decontamination of the nuclear reactor facilities in Mayaguez, additional favorable space, in addition to that available at the Rio Piedras facility, should be able to accommodate the projected expansion.

Summary Table S-3 titled "Total Program Budget Distribution by Type of Research, Development, Demonstration, and Education and Training," shows that the largest component, as previously pointed out, is "Development." For details of budget distribution for a particular program, refer to the corresponding Table 3 in the respective program section.

Next section begins here.

"No year 2030, we advocate a secret system, your honesty 280 to w% by w TeteTD.

X. NUCLEAR PROGRAM

A. Nuclear Fusion Program

Nuclear fusion promises to be the ultimate and optimum solution for the energy problem for humanity. The first nuclear fusion reactors will use tritium fuel. Approximately 85% of the energy in this type of reaction is liberated in the form of 14 MEV neutrons. Any machine designed to harness the energy produced by this type of reaction must convert the 14 MEV neutron energy into a manageable form.

The most commonly considered concept to harness the 14 MEV neutron energy in fusion reactors is by permitting the energy to be deposited in a lithium blanket designed to breed the required tritium 107 and the heat generated in the blanket is removed by conventional heat exchanger technology to operate a Rankine cycle. This approach does not lend itself to the generation of out reactor fuels.

Hydrogen production from water decomposition with 14 MEV neutrons is of particular interest in the harnessing of this fusion energy for the generation of out reactors fuels. CEER has at its facilities in Mayaguez a 150 KEV proton accelerator and facility which produces 14 MEV neutrons in a target reaction which could be effectively used for this purpose.

Existing experimental data on the conversion efficiencies of radiolytic water decomposition indicate values of 10%. Some experimental data indicate higher efficiencies (30 to 40%), but results are not fully understood and the researchers have

X2 not been able to duplicate experimental results such as the CIRENE reactor experiments. More importantly, however, there is no data using 14 MEV neutrons as a source. It is estimated that 30-40 conversion efficiencies in radiolytic decomposition of water with 14 MEV neutrons can result in acceptable hydrogen/electricity production scenarios.

CEER proposal of February 1977 entitled "Feasibility Design Study Project for a 100 KWE Level Pilot Plant Fueled by Hydrogen Produced by Direct Solar Heat"."

Contains a detailed discussion of the most promising thermochemical cycles to date. The use of LMFV neutrons in a thermochemical step can result in eliminating inconvenient high temperature steps of a particular suitable thermochemical cycle. CEER has been in contact with KMS Fusion of Ann Arbor, Michigan in an effort to establish such a program. KMS Fusion is willing to develop a joint effort with CEER in this area. In addition, CEER personnel will maintain themselves abreast of the new developments in Fusion Technology by attending seminars, symposia, reading literature, and holding occasional local lectures.

1B. Nuclear Fission Program

In the field of nuclear fission, CEER proposes to monitor and transfer technological information from the national laboratories to interested CEER/UPR, P.R. industry and Latin American countries interested personnel. Distinguished investigators and professors will be invited from time to time to present findings and developments to CEER personnel. CEER personnel will attend national meetings, conferences, symposia, etc. Tables I-1 through XI-4 illustrate the funding and effort

scheduled.

TABLE 1 NUCLEAR PROGRAM BUDGET (In Thousands $)

A. Nuclear Fusion Program

B. Nuclear Fission Program

TOTAL 658080

TABLE X-2 NUCLEAR PROGRAM

BUDGET - PROGRAM PERSONNEL DISTRIBUTION

Nuclear Program Scientific Staff

Technical staff

Administrative Staff

TABLE X-3 - NUCLEAR PROGRAM

TYPE OF RESEARCH

Nuclear Program Basic Research

Development Demonstration Education & Training

Personnel Equipment & Materials Services

TOTALS

PREPARED PROGRAM PLAN FOR UPR/CEER

FY 1980 and FY 1981, Introduction

The Council of Higher Education authorized the establishment of CEER effective July 1, 1976 after one year successful negotiation with ERDA (now DOE). The negotiations with ERDA (now DOE) were summarized in an action memorandum dated April 11, 1976. The establishment...

CEER phased out the operation of the P. R. Nuclear Center (PRC), which had been in operation since 1957. This change was a result of new needs to focus on the changing world energy situation. A document was prepared in April 1977 entitled "Integrated Program Plan for UPR/CEER FY 1977-82". It consisted of 50 pages plus five appendices entitled: (1) Biomass Research, (2) Solar Research, (3) Solar Materials Research, (4) Conservation Research, and (5) Bio-conversion

Research. This document was to serve as a guide for energy and research programs for the recently established CEER organization. The programs described in the above document and the funding and budget allocations have undergone changes and revisions. These changes and revisions are the result of the natural development process, research findings, budget restrictions, schedule restrictions, personnel availability, newly set priorities, etc. This document revises the original Integrated Program Plan, establishing new plans for the FY 1980 and FY 1981, per CEER.

The original organization chart of CEER indicated four main Divisions: (1) Base Programs, (2) Biomedical Research, (3) Environmental Research, and (4) Energy Research. In addition to the above Divisions, there were five administrative units attached to the Center's Director’s Office: (a) Health and Safety, (b) Training and Education, (c) Administration and Services, (d) Technical Services and (e) Facility Decontamination. Various organizational changes have occurred during the period mainly due to program reorientation, budget restrictions, personnel availability, etc. Figure 1 shows the present CEER organization chart. As can be seen in Figure 1, there are five main Divisions as follows: (a) Solar; (b) OTE; (c) Environmental Sciences Comprising; (d) Marine Ecology, (e) Terrestrial Ecology; and (f) Biofuel. There are five administrative units attached to the Director's Office: (a) Energy Assessment and Analysis; (b) Public Awareness; (c) Library; (d)

Administration and Support Services, and e) Health and Safety, Budget Restriction. The greatest changes occurring in the original programs are mainly due to Budget Restrictions. Table 1 "Federal Funding" promised for CEER/UPR Transition Period shows the funding assignments contained in the referenced April 11, 1976 RDA (DOB) Action Memorandum. The dollars indicated in Table I are FY.

00008 $ - services - criteria - service cost - increases - sentences - year - cost increase - subsequent - give - office - scenario - 00's - SISKNY AON - show - status - Stand - passed - on - TwoRNONL ANE - sort - want - 01 - Not - vanishing - Kowa - was - so - 5 - saw - sort - story - TTS - my - must - men.

August 12, 207 - continued - use - by - was - as - were - discreet - best - Sd - use - as.

Annex PRIRA-CHDS 5 Rev. 0 - Lognity of the superheater in of the turbine. It will be a hazard to JORS. A public hearing was held in San Juan, 60. As a result of this hearing, an inter by the Presiding officer, 5 video - Water Resources Docket No. PP. The 4 for the extension to the completion of our facility described in the cone and among the United States Water Resources Authority, General Construction Company and in part, which are a part of the Secondary record herein - station authorization to provisional to the extent on the operation of the facility will not be issued by the there.

Submitted at a further public hearing which to consider the operating authorization, The Final report (portions of which may be submitted and evaluated and the Commission shall find that the final design, superheater, and data developed from the specified experiment programs, including the integrity of the verse, provide reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the people will not be endangered and that the operation of the facility will not be inimical to the common defense and

security as required by the Atomic Energy Act, as amended.

No use shall be made of nuclear fuel for the proposed application facility until further hearing and determination by the Commission, which shall be held.

Respecting the operating authorisation after the completion of the construction of this facility. "Any exceptions, if any, and brief in support thereof must be filed by July 18, 1950; protests in opposition thereto shall be filed by July 20, 1960, and if the Commission does not initiate a review on its own motion, and no exceptions are filed, this decision shall, in accordance with the Commission's Rules of Practice, become final on July 19, 1960." There being no exceptions filed, the above decision became final on July 15, 1960.

SPACE BOWS Nuclear Power Station is located near Rincon, on the western coast of Puerto Rico, and is jointly owned by the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority (PRWA). The initial operation of the reactor and plant have been given the operating authorisation No. DEAK, issued jointly to the Commission, the Sandia Corporation, and PRWA, with the responsibility of plant operations and activities assigned to CEND. The reactor is an integral part of the plant water boiling type, rated at 50 MW at 975 psi and 900°F. Superheated steam from the superheater fuel zone of the reactor core is supplied to the 17,300 kW turbine generator in a steam/feedwater cycle with reheating of the feedwater to 350°F prior to entering the reactor. It achieved initial criticality on April 13, 1964, consisting of 30 of the eventual total of 64 boiler fuel elements. On December 14, 1965, the startup phase of BORIS operations was completed with the successful conclusion of a full power demonstration run. The reactor was operated with its full complement of fuel at design pressure and temperature conditions and the power generation equipment delivered approximately 95 percent of generator capacity to the grid. During the intervening time, a relatively large number of core configurations were tested and analysed to establish their nuclear, thermal, and hydraulic characteristics. The core configurations tested under cold experimental conditions were the following: 6x6 boiler assembly without boiler shims, assembly with boiler shims, assembly with 50% boiler shims, reduced BORIS core, and full BORIS core. In addition to these cold experiments, extensive tests under hot operating conditions were carried out.

Weather conditions were conducted on the B'x 8 boiler core, the reduced element superheater core, and the full BONUS core to evaluate their nuclear control and thermal characteristics during steady-state and transient operating modes. The sequence of the experiments conducted and other milestones of BONUS operation are presented in the chronological history table below. The experiments described in this report represent the preoperations analysis program defined in Modification No. 16 to Contract AT(0-1)-2674. This report has been prepared in fulfillment of the requirements of Modification No. 16 and in order to provide guidance to the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority for subsequent plant operation.

Details of the BONUS reactor and plant have been exhaustively described in EOS documents, namely, the Final Standards Fe 5; the Technical Specifications; the Final Primary Design Report, PRARA-GNEC-6, and the Startup Summary Report. Descriptive matter relating to design aspects has been presented in this report. It is assumed that the reader is acquainted with the BONUS reactor and its plant systems.

CHRONOLOGICAL HISTORY OF BONUS OPERATION

Initial loading of 6% enriched fuel: April 13
Initial criticality with 6 x 6 unshimmed boiler core: April 24
Cold and hot critical experiments at zero power with full core to measure nuclear characteristics: July 1-5
Cold critical experiments in preparation for power on with boiler core: July 6
Operation with boiler core electrical generation during test generator with saturated steam: July 7
Over operation with boiler core up to a maximum of 30 mwt: July 8
Critical experiments with full core: July 17-August 4
Operation and reduced power operation: August 5
Start of cold critical experiments on the reduced superheater assembly core: February 6
Start of power operation with reduced core: April 5
First electrical generation utilizing superheated steam with reduced core: May 5
Maximum steady-state power of 40 MWt (7.1 MWe) with reduced core: May 7

Revised version:

Restart approved. Full core criticals and reactor power to 10 x(t) x September. Full 90 Mw/t reactor power level with all reactor steam bypassed to condense. September 20, turbine loaded to 16 Mw. November 9-10, reactor overload test at 55 Mw(t) and generator max capability of 19.2 Mw(e) (gross). November 18, output power demonstration run, 9965 Mw(e)-net. December 19, completion of startup period.

1. INTRODUCTION PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The ABC and the PRWRA have agreed to terminate operation of the BONUS reactor facility and decommission the plant. The type of decommissioning selected includes key features such as:

1. Removal from the site of all special nuclear materials and certain highly activated components such as control rods and shims.
2. In-place "entombment" of the pressure vessel and associated internal components within the biological shield.
3. Decontamination of contaminated systems external to the entombment boundary so they may be left in place.

The decommissioned plant was to be left in a condition where radiation and contamination levels were sufficiently low to allow unrestricted access by the general public when the facility was open. This goal is particularly important since the facility is to be used as an exhibition center for several years immediately following decommissioning.

1.2 PROGRAM APPROVAL

On May 26, 1969, PRWRA requested authorization from the AEC, Division of Reactor Licensing, to dismantle the BONUS Reactor. On August 11, 1969, DRL

issued the order authorizing the dismantling of the BONUS facility (Reference 1). This order includes the following stipulations:

1. Dismantling of the facility shall be in accordance with the PRWRA application of May 26, 1969, and the Decommissioning Plan (Reference 2) submitted therewith.
2. After completion of the dismantling and decontamination of the facility, PRWRA shall submit a report describing the condition of the remaining structure and the post-decommissioning.

corrected, evacuate the premises promptly and notify the Public Health Department of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico immediately.

A capsule containing drawings and technical data relative to this facility is buried in the structure. Its location and a description of its contents can be found in the records of the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, Main Office, in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

On the main floor reading level, a plaque with the following text in English and Spanish will be set into the concrete surface:

"BONUS NUCLEAR POWER FACILITY. CONSTRUCTED AND OPERATED JOINTLY BY THE PUERTO RICO WATER RESOURCES AUTHORITY AND THE U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION TO DEMONSTRATE THE TECHNOLOGY OF BOILING WATER-NUCLEAR SUPERHEAT. IT ACCOMPLISHED ITS OBJECTIVE AND WAS DECOMMISSIONED IN 1970.

Entombed in this structure are radioactive materials which could be hazardous if exposed. Entry is prohibited without the specific authorization from appropriate officials of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. If the structure is breached, evacuate the premises promptly and notify the Public Health Department of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico immediately."

Surveillance Program: A post-decommissioning inspection will be conducted by representatives of the Commission.

Program Summary:

End Product Description: The total radioactive inventory remaining in the decommissioned BONUS plant is 54,284 curies (C). Of this, 13.8 millicuries (mC) are contained in the form of scale, in piping and components external to the entombment system. The remainder is contained within the entombment system. The inventory, as a function of time, is as follows:

Entombment System Date Total C Major Nuclides, %

Initial (Aug. 1968) 54,288 Fe(63), Co(29), Co(4), Mn(2), Ni(2)
50 yr (year 2018) 600 Fe(96), Co(4)
140 yr (year 2108) 296 W(100), Co(<1)

BONUS NUCLEAR POWER FACILITY: Decommissioned in 1970.

"Breach. Vacate the premises promptly and notify the Public Health Department of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico immediately. A capsule containing drawings and technical data relative to this facility is buried in the structure. Its location and a description of its contents may be found in the records of the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority, Main Office, at San Juan, Puerto Rico.

The text appears to be in a different language and some parts are unclear. Unfortunately, I can't correct it accurately.

September 9, 1965. As per your letter dated May 27, we have completed preliminary geological and hydrological assessments of the three sites. We have also scattered cement and ash at the sites and had discussions with members of the Geological Survey. We also conducted marine geological studies in Muerte Tso. In general, the geology and hydrology for each site provide clear information to determine the suitability of the site for a nuclear power reactor. As an example, the regional geology...

Dons though accurate provide only background data which must be enhanced by information on the occurrence, distribution, or use of not yet vetted architectural features. Some of this interest in information comes from published geological maps such as the Government trees of the Tortuguero dunes and one published in the sheets in the distribution map of the sites within the Tambals, Puerto Rico. In an active seismic zone, it has been subjected to earthquakes of magnitude 1.5 and contains many west to northwest trending sites and fault zones. Without detailed field investigations, it is difficult to determine whether the many faults which are shown on the map have displaced deposits considered to be Pleistocene or Recent (i.e., less than 500,000 years old). With Puerto Rico in an active seismic zone, it is recommended that considerably more detailed geologic information be submitted by the applicant before any decision is made on the suitability of the three proposed sites. Even with this, a field study may be necessary. Tortuguero, on the north coast of Puerto Rico, lies just north of the great and possibly very young deposits (Recent). The proposed site location is uncertain due to a thick limestone ledge that characteristically contains.

Tea and other collection items continue. Haber Montgomery proposed a design for the seasonal adjustments. Therefore, Geological surveys are being conducted in this area. Faults are shown to be present within the northwest, into the cities that show effects of displacement. In the timepiece, bows of the eerie cut down the sea and this new set of geological investigations are being conducted in an area just east of a point covered in lilies and roses. Apparently, the flood was caused by some of these faults. It was recorded to be as young as Recent (10,000) years old. There are six faults shown on the map of this area, also gravel and sensor networks are being set up to cover the courses of the bike ride, which is significantly more complex than sites A and B. Again, the details of this area and should be.

The text appears to be quite jumbled, but here's an attempt at making sense of it:

There is a need to complete an investigation on a lone stone mooring site in Hele City. The tethers tie best, perhaps because of the lapping of the sea. To precede, one has to own a rental. The

development here shows in a summary. The following elements are pertinent in considering the nuclear hover reactors. Diets are not scientifically active areas. The total land has been undated several times since the Oligocene time, some 23,000,200 years ago, and in some areas – especially the southern parts – genetics may have been displaced in the past by pulses that accompanied earthquakes. The geography of the north and south coasts of the island will require some unique exploration and construction problems. The hydrology of the three sites probably does not present a problem.

The geology of the three sites suggests that it is not one of the key indicators of deformation and, therefore, is not a suitable site for the proposed project. We can provide detailed geological profiles of each site, such as location and age of faults and the genesis of karst topography. This information is required. We would be pleased to discuss further details with you.

Sincerely yours,
BR, Marsh Assistant
Chief Geologist for Engineering Services

Site 38, which is not expected to be a problem, serves the case sites. All the connection plans are at twenty-five sites. A review of the current air standards is needed. The plant's main capacity of 538 won is due to combustion products. The new site must be carefully monitored and controlled for radioactive gas emissions from several nuclear reactors. These reactors are considerably below biological hazard thresholds, so no effects are expected from their continuous operation.

3. Large shipments of gas have to be made frequently, in contrast with the infrequent and compact shipments of waste.

4. Architectural aesthetics, including the presence of high towers, are to be considered for the new plant.

5. Costs for a fossil plant are significantly higher than those for a moderately sized nuclear plant.

The text appears to be a discussion on the benefits of nuclear power for Puerto Rico, as well as a financial summary of a proposed project. Here's a corrected version:

"Benaslaapeoail, here is a proposed idea to add to these points the fact that nuclear power brings one Puerto Rico planning over and of the portable power to enforce the reliability of potential electricity on the island of Puerto Rico. Since the island is solely dependent on its own resources, and in the event of a national crisis, the reliability of a power plant operating on nuclear fuel is immeasurably necessary for the future.

TABLE x9: FINANCIAL SUMMARY
1. Estimated Cost: $1.6 billion
2. Total Estimated Cost: $175 million
3. Fort Punt Estimates: $300 million
4. Total Capital Cost (Estimated): $585 million
5. Net Cost Savings: $18.6 million

6. Projected Value of Annual Cost Savings: $2.2 billion
7. Short-term Cost: $1.52 billion
8. Long-term Debt: $1.23 billion

Extensive studies show that gas-powered and nuclear plants will yield their optimum economic benefits in Puerto Rico when operated as baseload units. Seasonal and daily variations in power demand must be met, therefore, fossil-fired plants must be used for more economical development. A balanced mix of gas and nuclear plants is then the ideal combination.

SELECTION OF PLANT SITE: The selection of the plant site was determined by a Benefit/Cost Review Process.

In retrospect, this was done.

It is crucial to note that costs derived from gas treatments are significantly higher than $175 million, with an estimated cost of $88 million and $186 million over 33 years. To yield their optimum, plants need to be operated as baseload units, considering seasonal and daily variations."

Evaluations must be used to practically assess the situation. A balance needs to start from the best combination projection. However, it has been noted that possible power plant sites were not suitable for the addition of major power plant 18. Consequently, the decision was made to select several studies. These studies were conducted on possible sites that would be stable not only for fossil but nuclear power plants as well. Teams of engineers and agronomists visited each of these sites and descriptions of topography, demography, meteorology, facilities, and the financial and socioeconomic status of the sites were obtained.

Table 1 shows the physical characteristics of the considered sites. After preliminary information was obtained, several meetings were held with various agencies. Each of the proposed sites was further assessed with members of the Puerto Rico Power Board and Federal agencies in order to obtain pertinent information regarding the stability for a nuclear plant.

Ponta Higuera site was one of the first to be considered, but was later discarded mainly because of its remoteness from future food centers, its lack of adequate harbor facilities, which are necessary for the delivery of fuel and auxiliary equipment, and the limited accessibility of the site.

A study led by the Economic Development Administration titled "Yabucoa Report: Baseline Studies for Environmental Conservation in Industrial Area Development" considered the impact of industries on the ecology and economy of the Yabucoa Valley. The study provides an inventory of resources and an appraisal of environmental changes. Specifically, the study is very much concerned about air pollution in the Yabucoa Valley. Preliminary atmospheric studies established the possibility that gaseous emissions from fossil fuel units would be blown over Yabucoa and nearby areas, creating a smog problem.

Terrain configuration and prevailing winds seem to indicate that this could be a problem area. In addition, the PRWRA concluded that development cost for the first two units would be approximately $5,010,000 higher for the Yabucoa site.

The text appears to be very jumbled and contains many errors that seem to be due to a poor translation or transcription. However, I'll do my best to make it more coherent:

"Yubucow site is less than the Aguirre Site. The company was essentially interested in establishing a new power complex in an economically more depressed locale. The Yabusou site's physical and economic analysis was extensively studied, yet the site was not considered a prime contender.

SITE ALTERNATIVES

In the major city of Aecivo, the population of Gassica is 14,869, Areconwis is 20,792, Gwhia Ormtes Yauen is 36,403, Mina is 30,559, Guyente is 8,122, and Ve Al is 72,810. Vepe Bui0 is 28,377. The distance to the Mighoay Antes site is 2 miles.

Sources of existing water can be found and other water elements are well-deployed. The distance to the economic line from the site is 118 km, 2 miles to the MS lake, and 10 miles to the west.

The water site area poses problems that need to be determined. Industrial areas such as Tortupiera Lagoa have unique advantages, including a major led center with port facilities in San Jonata. In Bowie, plans are already in effect for a power site.

From a power saturation standpoint, this was not considered to be a prime candidate. One advantage of this site is that it appears to be one of the best areas seismically on the Island.

After considering the proposed sites, the PRWRA selected Aguirre as the best site, which would be suitable for either conventional or nuclear power plants. There was no outstanding disadvantage to the site. The Puerto Rico Planning Board was encouraging industrial development away from the San Juan metropolitan area to the southern part of the island, i.e., to an area such as the Gergana subregion.

The benefits on which the present decision was based to locate the Power Plant Complex at the Aguirre Site were substantial. This is the best site for thermal and nuclear units. The existing plant site is already under development for maximum impact on the effects as compared with few others."

The provided text seems to be highly scrambled and contains a combination of incomplete sentences, fragments, and nonsensical phrases. Without more context or knowledge of the intended meaning, it is impossible to provide a full and accurate correction. However, I've attempted to correct some parts of the text:

"3. The site elsewhere is currently not ideal, but it has great potential for future industrial development. 4. The area is sparsely populated and is situated well away from any metropolitan area. 5. There is a protected harbor that is easily accessible both by land and water.

This is the best site for the construction of a power plant that consists of a combination of fossil and nuclear units. The existing plant site, owned by PRIPRA, is under development for fossil units and so there would be minimal impact on the environment in terms of construction effects when compared to clearing and grading a new site elsewhere.

The area is presently depressed, but it has good potential for future industrial growth. The area is sparsely populated and is well removed from any metropolitan area. There is a protected harbor that is easily accessible by land and water.

1. Transmission: The site has fired units, a substation, and existing power plants. The design ensures that during operation, there are no additional towers, and planning is focused on minimizing the environmental impact. The transmission system is integrated with the existing system.

2. Heat Dissipation: Out of all the alternative options, the selection of the best alternative for heat dissipation from the power plant was based on a cost-benefit analysis.

The next part of the study involves the Nuclear Center at Jobos Bay. It soon became apparent that the ecological values of the Bay were of significant importance."

The rest of the text could not be deciphered and corrected due to a lack of context and coherence in the provided text.

The text appears to be in a mix of English and Spanish and contains several typos and formatting issues. However, due to the scrambled nature of the text, it's challenging to correct it accurately. Here's an attempt, but it may not be 100% accurate:

Se ha convocado a una vista pública pero el Alcalde, Hon. Joaquin Rosa, pidió que se realice una segunda vista pública. Esta segunda vista pública se fijó para el 27 de Febrero de 1957 a las 7:30 PM. En dicha vista pública un grupo presentó un proyecto presunto y un tal Adolph J. Ackerman se involucró, sirviendo como consultor en estos asuntos nucleares. Cabe destacar que es costumbre de todos los ciudadanos que se oponen al establecimiento de las centrales nucleares expresar su preocupación por la seguridad de estas instalaciones, así como desear tener la atención de esta Honorable Junta para obtener información pertinente a este asunto.

El 24 de junio de 1765 el Sr. Ackerman presentó testimonio ante el Comité Congresional Conjunto de Energía Atómica oponiéndose a la extensión del "Price-Anderson Indemnity Act" por un período de diez años. Incluido para la consideración de esta Honorable Junta está el texto del Sr. Ackerman ante el Comité Congresional.

También se incluye material del "Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS)" quienes realizaron una investigación detallada de los puntos de vista del Sr. Ackerman. Como se puede inferir de esta correspondencia, podemos decir que el Sr. Ackerman no tiene conocimientos ni experiencia alguna sobre plantas termoeléctricas y menos sobre plantas nucleares, siendo completamente un laico en esta materia.

Esto plantea una serie de interrogantes. En la página 14 de los minutos del Congreso que se incluyen, pueden observar las conclusiones a las que llegó el "Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards": (1) No hay fundamentos para sostener ninguna de las alegaciones del Sr. Ackerman. (2) Se apunta la gran ignorancia del Sr. Ackerman. El tipo de planta que la Autoridad planea

instalar en el área de Tortuguero es un tipo cuya seguridad está completamente probada, que comprende uno de dos tipos: control con reactor de agua hirviendo o central con reactor de agua a presión. Esto lo demuestra.

Gran número de órdenes por centrales nucleares que se han puesto en Estados Unidos últimamente, las cuales han revolucionado todo tipo de predicciones hasta llegar al punto de que la capacidad total en megavatios en plantas nucleares ordenada durante el año 1765 excedió a la capacidad ordenada en plantas convencionales. Esta Autoridad está dispuesta a ilustrar a esta Honorable Junta de Planificación y a sus asesores técnicos sobre detalles de la seguridad involucrada en este tipo de centrales si creen la Junta conveniente. Todos los proyectos para la construcción de una central de energía nuclear tienen que ser aprobados por la División de Licenciamiento de Reactores de la Comisión de Energía Atómica quienes, en consulta directa con el Comité Consultor sobre Seguridad de Reactores (Advisory Committee on Reactor Safety) (ACRS), pasan juicio sobre el diseño de la instalación y celebran vistas públicas donde los ciudadanos pueden expresar sus puntos de vista en cuanto al espectro de seguridad involucrado. Luego de un exhaustivo estudio y análisis por parte de la Comisión, ésta aprueba o rechaza el proyecto si éste no se ajusta a los requisitos de seguridad establecidos por la Comisión.

Durante el proceso de la construcción, la División de Construcción de la Comisión de Energía Atómica examina y pasa juicio sobre la construcción y las pruebas a que ha sido sometida toda la estructura. Al determinarse que todo se ha construido y probado de acuerdo a las normas establecidas, la Comisión acepta como válida la fase de construcción y pruebas. Luego la División de Exámenes de Reactores de la Comisión procede a examinar a todos los operadores incluyendo ingenieros y técnicos operadores que deberán encargarse de la operación de la central. Estos exámenes por lo general duran un día dividiéndose en una parte del examen escrito y otra del examen oral. A los candidatos que aprueban el examen se les otorga una licencia de operación. En este punto la organización correspondiente tiene los operadores licenciados requeridos.

Preparada para operar la central, la Comisión le otorgó la Licencia de operación a la organización, en este caso a la Autoridad. Durante la supervisión de la planta, la División de "Compliances" continúa auditando, a través de visitas periódicas, la operación de la planta para asegurarse de que esta se está operando de acuerdo a las leyes. Esto nos permite operar siempre con personal idóneo y debidamente entrenado y licenciado, cosa que no podemos hacer con las centrales convencionales debido a las muchas trabas de los convenios colectivos existentes bajo los cuales operamos las centrales convencionales. Sobre el aspecto de desarrollo con el área, deseamos enfatizar que el establecimiento de esta central termonuclear no interfiere con el desarrollo turístico del área sostenido expresado por el suscrito, y más aún preferimos este tipo de centrales debido a su baja contaminación potencial. Esta Autoridad está en disposición de declarar cualquier otra causa o someter cualquier información adicional que sea necesaria. Tratado V. Urrutia Director Ejecutivo Consistentemente, etc Central File Reading File Drs. Modesto Ariarte.

UBICACIÓN DE UNA CENTRAL TERMONUCLEAR EN EL AÑO 245 NUEVAS SALAS 173 DE AVRAMATT. Llevada a cabo el día 27 de febrero de 1957, a las 7:00 a.m., en el Salón de Actos de la Urbanización Pública Enrique Zonta. RAMÓN GARCÍA SANTIAGO Presidente HARRY MALDONADO Secretario.

8 de marzo de 17 Re: Central Termonuclear Tortuguero. Corte de: 17 de septiembre de 1763, 14 de junio de 1965, 4 de junio de 1765, 7 de marzo de 1958, 1 de enero de 1966. Esta Autoridad sometió a la Junta de Planificación con fecha 19 de septiembre de 1963 una consulta de ubicación para la Central Termonuclear en el sitio de La Laguna Tortuguero en la municipalidad de Manatí. En nuestra invocación de 14 de junio de 1965 dimos más información a la Junta sobre el proyecto termonuclear en Tortuguero e instrucciones sobre la necesidad de utilizar estos terrenos para este propósito. En la comunicación de 21 de junio de 1925 transmitimos al Honorable.

The text seems to be in Spanish but is riddled with typographical errors and non-standard symbols. Here's an attempt to correct it:

"Junta información relativa a estudios del web-solo. Con fecha del 7 de marzo de 1945, a veces a la Honorable Junta, los plenos de menura de las fincas concernidas y solicitamos aprobación de la Junta para la adquisición de estos terrenos. En nuestra comunicación del 11 de octubre de 1965, volvimos a notificar a la Junta que la Autoridad continúa con mirando terrenos en Tortuguero para el establecimiento de una central termo-nuclear. El 21 de noviembre de 1966, se celebró una vista pública en el Municipio de Nanotf en relación a la ubicación de este proyecto. La Autoridad describió y expuso el proyecto, contestó preguntas, y dio énfasis sobre la seguridad de este tipo de instalación. En dicha vista pública no hubo gran oposición, pero el Alcalde, Hon. Joaquín Roza, pidió que se diera la oportunidad de una segunda vista pública. Esta segunda vista pública se fijó para el 27 de febrero de 1967 a las 7:00. En dicha vista pública, un grupo opositor al proyecto presentó a un tal Adolfo J. Ackerman de Madison, Wisconsin como su consultor en asuntos nucleares. Caso que en contra de todos los individuos que se oponen al establecimiento de las centrales nucleares serán duros.

Vino del Sr. Acuerdo. Señor E. Ginng de la Reactor (No existen. (2) Se el tamaño de planta que la Autoridad piensa que será seguro y completo para el área de Ter, probablemente que comprenda inversiones en central y reactor. En la derrota al gran acuerdo en federaciones con centrales nucleares en esos lentes por cuales han venido a ver. Se dice que la capacidad total a manejar en plantas nucleares en el año 1755 excedió a la de las actuales. Esta Autoridad está dispuesta a llevar a esta Honorable Junta de Harmonización una visión de la seguridad nuclear en este ingenio de Ter, y proyecta para la construcción de una central de energía nuclear, tienen que ser aprobadas por la División de Reactores de la Comisión de Energía Atómica, quienes en consulta directa con el Comité Consultor sobre Seguridad de Reactores."

The text provided appears to be highly garbled or in a language that is not identifiable. It consists of a mix of words and symbols that do not form coherent sentences in any known language. Unfortunately, without more context or a clearer version of the text, I am unable to assist in fixing it.

Measurement 1: On June 2, 2001, it was confirmed that the temperature was not a limiting factor for the development. Phase 2: A team of experts was assembled to cover all aspects of the project.

The Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards (ACRS) provided advice on safety considerations. The project was also evaluated for its environmental and social impact. It should be noted that this

favorable recommendation does not apply to the acquisition of land or the construction project, which will be considered at a later date.

This is a request for construction approval. APPLICATIONS AND for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

The following applications were submitted to the Planning Board of Puerto Rico:

1. 35-P STG: Application for land and waterway operation.
2. 26-P: Second extension for construction of a power plant in Aguirre.
3. 225-7: Third extension for location of access roads and transmission lines.
4. 70-023-P: Authorization for land moving operations and access roads.
5. 22-7: First extension authorizing the construction of two fossil units, substations, warehouses, and fuel storage tanks.
6. 10-623-P: Second extension authorizing the acquisition of lands necessary for the construction of the cooling water system.
7. 10-623-P: Third extension authorizing the construction of a nuclear plant, substations, and a discharge canal.

The applications were approved by the Planning Board of Puerto Rico.

"With no conditions, May 24, 1907, approved with Public Works. Acceptance conditions in meeting on Jan. 17, 1968, approved with no conditions in the meeting of Sept 12, 1969. Approved with 90 conditions on Nov. 28, 1970. Approved with no conditions in meeting of Jun. 9, 1970. Approved subject to authorizations of the Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board (EQB) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in the meeting of April 29, 1971. Approved subject to authorization of EQB in meeting held on Sept. 3, 1971. Approved subject to authorization from the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission on Sept. 3, 1971.

June 25, 1973. The preliminary study for intended nuclear plant siting along the coast of Puerto Rico has been practically finished. The study includes all the coast of Puerto Rico except the area included between Dorado city east to Las Cabezas in Fajardo and the area between Aguirre and Ponce. These two areas were excluded because in the first area tourism and population concentrations prohibit the location of power plants and the second area was excluded because enough information is available from previous studies.

From the preliminary information developed, the north-central coast of Puerto Rico (Arecibo to just east of Tortuguero) has the highest potential for nuclear plant sites. Other areas such as Cobo Rojo, Rincon, and Aguadilla up to Isabela have been found to be with offshore sedimentary layers severely tilted, folded, and faulted. Although the preliminary study does not rule out completely such sites, it is advised that they will face more difficult problems in the licensing process.

The area east of Isabela and especially east of Arecibo shows markedly miles and miles of sedimentary Miocene rock (20 million years old) undisturbed. There are however some minor faults buried at an estimated depth of 2500 below the sea floor and overlaid by undisturbed Miocene rocks. One of the faults has been found from the offshore seismic data to have an east-west strike

with southern inclination a few miles east."

The text appears to be about a geological study of Punta Chivato, where a fault is suspected to be located. It also discusses upcoming fieldwork and recommendations for future actions. However, the text contains numerous typographical errors and inconsistencies, making it difficult to understand. Here is my best attempt at correcting it:

The fault is east of Punta Chivato. However, since the fault appears to be deeply buried (indicating it's an old fault), geologists have not been able to find any trace or geological feature indicating the presence of it inland. The fault just happens to be near the Tortuguero site (about 1 salt test to the west at the FRWEA site). The recommendation of the Geologist is that two of these sites should be used to drop at this time the Punta. It is the closest one to the minor AL Geological site. Make ground trenches east of Punta Chivato where the fault enters the land to determine if it's present and any characteristics. Take samples in the section expected to be offset. Areas where quaternary eolian deposits are between 100,000 to 1,000,000 years old will be tested using various techniques including: 1) Paleomagnetism 2) Amino-acid dating. 3. Make drill holes in the area to determine stratigraphy and foundation mechanics. At Tortuguero, probably one or two holes will be required. At Islote, a new series of drill holes will be needed.

Perform detailed and close high-resolution seismic profiles offshore in front of the two sites and at critical states such as east of Punta Chivato where the supposed fault enters the land. The aim is to prove without doubt the presence of undisturbed sequences of rocks above offshore faults. Further seismology lines inland will be determined from previous data at Tortuguero. The preliminary work already performed will be compiled in a comprehensive report, ready by the end of August. After the Authority receives it, it should be submitted formally to the AEC. It may take up to three months for them to process and give their opinion. Despite this, I recommend that we should not wait for an AEC ruling and should continue with the studies previously described. This process will likely take at least six months.

Experienced. Cost to the Authority is of “interest during the national fossil fuel cost in competence with the year vote etc. {9} In the range of many, many millions of dollars. Conservation" escalation, and there is a good reasonable probability that Tortuguero as well as Islote of Patwan Atlas site can be licensed within 18-21 months if we act promptly and correctly. I therefore request your approval to continue the geo-seismic studies for Tortuguero and the Islote area and simultaneously start the preparation of a PEAR and EIS for Islote (with Tortuguero as an alternate site) with a target date of March 31, 1974 for filing with the A.E.C. such TSAR, LP. Contract Approved: cog Gee Wy Sey Pens fois, Chew Julio Negron, Executive Director

GENERAL CONSIDERATION AND PRELIMINARY INPUTS TO AGRO-INDUSTRIAL NUCLEAR ENERGY CENTER 1968-69

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The Committee for the Energy Center Study was appointed by the Directors of the participating Commonwealth Agencies and Federal Government Divisions on September 18, 1968. Its functions

are to coordinate all the activities related to this study and provide, through its Manager, an effective assistance to the organization or firm contracted to carry on the work. The effort and dedication of the members of the Committee made possible the compilation of the data and information included in this brochure, entitled "General Consideration and Preliminary Inputs to the Agro-Industrial Nuclear Energy Center: PRWRA - January 22, 1969

FOR THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN PUERTO RICO A. Introduction

During the last quarter of a century, Puerto Rico has experienced a rapid and impressive development. The gross product of the Puerto Rican economy surpassed 3.3 billion dollars in 1966-67, more than eleven times the 1940 figures. Similarly, per capita income was $1,037, compared to $121 in 1940. In the fields of education, public health, transportation, and public utilities, unprecedented progress has been made. However, this same progress...

Many complex problems have been introduced, such as pollution, traffic congestion, and shortages in public facility services. To solve these and other problems, it is the policy of the Government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to encourage development in certain growth poles and promising centers, like Ponce and Mayaguez. (See Map 93 in the appendix on growth centers.) The implementation of this policy is necessary, among other reasons, to create favorable environments for the development of industry and attractive residential environments for professionals, managerial, and technical achievers of the growth pursued. This will also reduce the flow of people to Metropolitan San Juan while also reducing regional disparities in employment opportunities and income levels. Plans have already been implemented to promote growth in other areas, like the Southwest, to counterbalance the slow rise of incomes in the Southern part of Puerto Rico compared to the Northern part.

The Southwest Region, comprised of the metropolitan area of Ponce and Mayaguez and adjoining municipalities, offers a special opportunity for carrying out a joint program of development which could have a significant influence in achieving the objective of reducing income disparities among the three regions of Puerto Rico. Considerable efforts are being made to broaden the region's economic base by promoting manufacturing establishments, using industrial incentives of various types, and improving the urban and regional infrastructure. About 21,000 manufacturing jobs have been created in the region under this program. Future plans for industry and agriculture will heavily depend on the development of water resources due to the critical nature of said resources in the region. High priority has been given to the development of the Southwest in the Commonwealth's capital improvement program. To this effect, the

The Planning Board is now engaged in the formulation of a comprehensive development plan for this region. Emphasis is being placed on the formulation of functional plans for achieving the desired goals in industrial development, tourism, education, agriculture, transportation, public utilities, and complementary community facilities. (See Part V of this report for Long Range Goals and Projections, as prepared by the Puerto Rico Planning Board.)

--- Page Break ---

WATER SUPPLY AND USAGE IN THE SOUTHERN REGION OF PUERTO RICO

Introduction: The shortage of water in the southern region of Puerto Rico is a cause for concern to the Commonwealth Government. The problem is becoming so serious that many industrial and agricultural jobs may be kept in abeyance. The policy of the Commonwealth Government is to urgently seek solutions to these problems and to design programs and projects meeting the high water consumption needs of heavy industrial complexes in the southern region.

Site and Development: The Southern Region of Puerto Rico has the following 14 municipalities: Ponce, Peñuelas, Guayanilla, Yauco, Guanica, Juana Diaz, Villalba, Santa Isabel, Coamo, Salinas, Guayama, Arroyo, Patillas, Maunabo. (See Map #1 with various contours.)

--- Page Break ---

Water usage will be approximately 24.3 MGD distributed as follows: Industrial 5.9, Agriculture 15.0, Commercial 3.4. The net impoundable surface water availability is actually approximately 202 MGD. The groundwater availability is approximately 217 MGD. Assuming all this water could be used, and further, assuming that the net impoundable surface water availability would remain constant, for the year 1980 there will be a net deficit of 105.3 MGD in the Southeast region (525.3 - 292.217). This clearly indicates that other sources of water have to be found to be able to cope with the expected development of the area. One of these additional sources could be the diversion of a significant amount of water from the Northern part of the Island to the Southern part.

Part. No. The source (approximately 24,500 acre-feet) will be obtained from the spill-over of the Guayas Dam, which will be collected in another dam downstream. But another promising source should not be overlooked: the "Planning Board M. Memorandum #410, Water Resources Needs".

The urgent need for water in the region, available sites for dams, and the high cost of diverting water from the other side of the central divide, are just a few of the reasons that justify a careful study of nuclear desalination. This, in addition to its general utility, will produce large amounts of potable water. The technology for desalination is developing at a rapid pace, while the cost of supplying water to the Southeast increases. The needed water for the Southeast represents an extraordinary challenge that requires a coordinated effort, if the development of the area is to become a reality.

33 VI. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

General Considerations: In regard to the industrial sector of the overall complex, the Economic Development Administration considers the following general factors to be very important:

1. The area in which the energy center complex is to be located should have an existing or potential harbor sufficiently large to provide port facilities for several heavy industries. The harbor should be at least 50 feet deep and should be in the immediate vicinity of the nuclear power plant.

2. At least 1,000 acres of reasonably level land should be available on the waterfront for industrial plant sites.

3. Plant capacity for each product analyzed should be the latest optimum size and incorporate proven technology. Products utilizing one or more principal raw materials from foreign sources should be given priority attention, as these raw materials are already flowing towards the U.S. mainland and Puerto Rico is merely intercepting the flow.

4. Products chosen for analysis should be those with good prospects for market growth in the U.S., as the mainland is our major market outlet.

The chosen analysis should require significant amounts of electrical power per ton of output in their production process.

7. A comparative analysis of production costs in Puerto Rico versus the optimum mainland location should be made for each product analyzed.

Products that could be considered for analysis are the following:

1. Alumina (2,000-3,000 KWh/ton) = A possibility. A trend in the industry is to produce alumina at the bauxite site.

2. Aluminum (14,090-15,000 KWh/ton) = We already know such a project is feasible in Puerto Rico at 4.25 mills for power. A portion of a potential 300,000 ton/year facility is to be located in Toa Baja. If a new plant is promoted, the Government favors Yabucoa as the site. Accordingly, the southwest area appears to be a good site for a third facility and a project of this nature is likely in the late 70s or early 80s. It is not felt that there is a need to study aluminum since we are well-informed about manufacturing costs and trends for this product.

3. Chlorine/caustic soda (3,400-4,000 KWh/ton) = A 500-ton/day chlorine plant is scheduled to go on stream in 1971 or 1972 in Guayanilla. The demand for chlorine is expected to double over the next ten years. We believe prospects for a second project of this nature are good. However, it is more likely to be located near one of the existing petrochemical complexes at Guayama or Yabucoa. Again, no analysis is believed required since we are well informed about manufacturing costs.

4. Ferro alloys (3,000-4,000 KWh/ton) = A plant with an initial demand of 45 MW is scheduled to go on stream in Ponce.

This could be a good candidate, depending on market growth.

5. Graphite (3,000-3,500 KWh/ton) - A plant with an initial demand of 45 MW is being built in Yabucoa. Such a project could be a good candidate for the energy center complex, depending on market trends.

6. Oxygen and other industrial gases - Two teams are proposed to build an industrial gas complex in Peñuelas to serve the South.

Cost by pipeline lines. It's unlikely another plant is required. Other products with high energy

requirements should be fine. Notion among the products to be analyzed in detail are comment and current.

1. Market A for calcium exrzide requires 3,000 KWH/ton.

2. Chromium: 2, 600-3, 400 KWH/ton with 1.2 million tons.

3. Cobalt: 2, 400-3, 200 KWH/ton is a byproduct of copper mining with 5,000 tons.

4. Fluorine: 5,600-6, 900 KWH/ton.

5. Lithium: 31,200-36, 000 KWH/ton.

6. Manganese: 10,000 KWH/ton.

7. Magnesium: 22,400 KWH/ton with increasing 150, 000 tons.

8. Nickel: 2,200 KWH/ton.

9. Phosphorus: 8, 000-11, 000 KWH/ton

10. Soldiers: 10,400 KWH/ton with 125,090 tons.

11. Silicon: 10, 000-12, 000 KWH/ton with 700, 000 tons.

12. Silicon carbide: 7, 000-8, 200 KWH/ton.

13. Titanium/zirconium: 30, 000-40, 000 KWH/ton with 10, 000-12, 000 tons market small but growing.

An analysis of producing 620,000 to 1,000,000 tons of salt should also be included. The cost of importing salt is approximately $55.32/ton, delivered on the dock. Any reduction below this cost would go to salt-based industries such as chlorine. Perhaps desalination should be considered a by-product with sufficient absorption of production costs by the salt production which could be sold for $4-$5/ton, bringing the cost of water down to a reasonable level from the present 80¢/1,000 gallons.

No processing plants for agricultural products have been included since these would depend on the type of products found feasible for the agro-storage of the crop. Likewise, petrochemical complexes have not been included since these are primarily dependent on obtaining import quotas for feedstock.

Annex 29 IV FACTORS AGAINST A NUCLEAR DECISION

Prototype units - None of the commercial units in operation today is an exact duplicate of the proposed nuclear unit. It has been a standing policy of the Authority that the commercial unit

proposed for operation in 1976, if nuclear, must be a completely well-proven concept, and if possible, a duplicate of an existing unit, so that the parameters used in the evaluation can be.

Readily ascertained, a duplicate of the unit quoted on by Westinghouse will not be in service before 1972. Connecticut Yankee, which has been advertised as a prototype of the quoted unit, differs in a very vital aspect: nuclear fuel condition.

1) The specific power, that is, the full load thermal kilowatts obtained from each kilogram of uranium in the core, is 27.7 at Connecticut Yankee, while the Puerto Rico unit would have a value of 36.5. This reduces core size. Connecticut Yankee thus operates under more conservative conditions.

2) The fuel burn up, that is, the kilowatt-days obtained from each kilogram of uranium at Connecticut Yankee is 24,000, while the proposed unit would have a fuel burn up of 31,500. While this increased burn up has been obtained in other reactors, it has never been proven under operating conditions in the type of reactor that has been proposed. Connecticut Yankee, therefore, is operating more conservatively in this respect.

3) Fuel cladding - Connecticut Yankee uses stainless steel cladding, while the proposed unit will use zircaloy. Although technically zircaloy should be satisfactory, the fact is that this type of cladding has not been used in commercial PWR reactors of the type and size which have been proposed.

These very important differences pose the probability of technical problems and the probable requirement of further debugging. Even more important, however, is the fact that the fuel costs which have been predicted under these accelerated conditions have not yet been realized.

It should be noted that fuel costs have a very important bearing on the economical evaluation of the nuclear unit. The accuracy of nuclear estimates is in question today. None of the nuclear plants built so far have met the estimated construction costs. The additional costs have ranged from 10% to 50% above the estimate. These have been caused by delays in the delivery of materials, labor problems, and the difficulty of obtaining the highly specialized workers.

Technicians who are required for a nuclear installation are very important, as is the additional cost of back-fitting requirements imposed by the Commission. It should be noted that even though the evaluated cost of a nuclear unit in our studies is of the order of $200 per kilowatt for a $70 MWe plant, higher cost figures have been estimated by some very well-known advocates of nuclear power.

From the Special Report ‘Nuclear Power in a Billion Dollar Stalemate,’ "Electric Light and Power, April 1969 (Ex. 3-4) "Nuclear power's soaring costs are being watched closely. Every utility executive contacted had facts and figures at their fingertips... facts that showed original estimates and the effect of time delays on these estimates. Typical of the cost problem is Omaha Public Power's announcement that their 1966 cost estimate of $93 million had jumped $30 million by the end of 1968. New York State Electric and Gas estimated their costs will be $35 million higher than the 1966 figures. Other utilities, not so eager to share their escalation costs openly, have indicated

that as much as $20 million have been added to capital costs before ground was broken.

The high costs are primarily due to the extensive construction schedule and decreased construction labor efficiency. A part of the cost increase can be attributed to inaccurate estimating, given that there was limited experience available to form the basis of good estimates. Additionally, costs have escalated due to the rising prices of materials and labor rates.

Another significant factor is the increased number and cost of safety features that must be incorporated into these plants as the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC) delves deeper into the design features, examining their potential hazards with increasing care. In our current studies and designs for utility clients, we are estimating nuclear plants that will be operational in 1974 and are in sizes of 800 to 1000 MW. The costs of these plants seem to be in the range of $180 to $200 per KW.

In light of the above statements, it seems that our estimate for the construction of nuclear units is on the low side.

3. Uncertainty of nuclear fuel

The main economic advantage of nuclear power is the reduced cost of nuclear fuel. In the economic study and in the bill evaluation, the low figure of 1.338 mills per kilowatt-hour has been used. This has been calculated on a price of $8.50 per pound of uranium.

However, this figure seems to be low, especially when the Edison Electric Institute has prepared a chart indicating that "all the uranium that might be found and produced at $15 a pound will be consumed by 1990."

Mr. Rangel, Vice President and General Manager of the Atomic Power Division, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, stated in his article "Only High Gain Breeder Reactors can Stabilize Uranium Fuel Requirements", published in Westinghouse Engineer in January 1968, that: “Even though presently known domestic supplies of low cost uranium are continuously enlarged by massive exploration efforts, fuel cost of water reactors will always be subject to the uncertainties of uranium ore costs if water reactors are the only type built. Thus, the really significant potential benefit of the breeder reactor to the electric utility...[text cut off]".

The text scrutinizes the construction of the unit, but also supervises very closely its operation throughout its life, especially after maintenance or equipment trouble. The Commission makes an intensive study of the breakage and will not allow the restart of the unit until a very thorough evaluation of the condition is made, and ensures that all safety precautions have been taken care of. Although this is necessary from a safety standpoint, it seriously impedes the ability of the utility to supply continuous and uninterrupted power to its consumers. Normally, if a boiler fan fails in a conventional unit, the utility will immediately take steps to repair it and the unit is back in operation in the shortest possible time. In nuclear plants, however, in the case of a small reactor leakage or a pump failure in the coolant system, the Commission will intervene and will make a very thorough inspection and evaluation of the incident and will not permit the restarting of the unit until all

assurances have been made that the failure has been corrected, and that all necessary precautions have been met to prevent a reoccurrence. This action delays the restoration of the unit back in the line, seriously impairing the utility's ability to serve power to its consumers. For systems within the Continental U.S. this may not be a very important consideration, since the interconnections will allow a certain measure of protection between the systems. However, in Puerto Rico, being an isolated system, a delayed outage of this sort may become very critical. Furthermore, in the U.S., due to the proximity to the supply sources and the availability of trained personnel, the repairs will be accelerated, permitting the restart of the unit in the shortest possible time. In Puerto Rico, an additional difficulty arises due to the fact that neither the personnel nor the parts are available on short notice. One of the most important factors which have led utilities in the U.S. to seriously consider backing out of nuclear reactors is...

16. A system is a moving target. Changes in design can come at any time and on any system. This can affect both plant costs and schedules. Costs also go up due to redundancy that often goes beyond engineering necessity. It does not seem reasonable to develop a safeguard for a hypothetical event that has already been precluded by another safeguard.

This type of personnel is not available in Puerto Rico. We will have to develop specialized personnel by the slow and painful process of training people in the United States, or else we will have to import these skilled workers, craftsmen, or technicians at a great cost. The shortage of highly specialized personnel and the competition within the industry for the available services is a serious problem facing the industry.

9. Financial market conditions - This is a very important consideration. The nuclear units will require at least a forty-million-dollar expenditure per unit over and above the cost of an equivalent fossil-fired unit. Although the Authority's financial position is such that it can obtain these funds if necessary, the current shortage of money in the financial market will not make it easy.

This is an easy task. The nuclear alternative requires a larger debt to equity ratio, and a wise financial strategy indicates that under the present money market conditions, the Authority should limit its expansion pattern to the lowest possible figures, and restrict its future expenditures to the bare essential needs.

To go into the market for a larger amount not only lowers the coverage of the Authority as defined by the Trust Indenture, but also may increase the interest rates and could probably affect the rating of RWRA bonds in the financial circles. It has been determined that the Authority has the earning capacity, and the financial backbone to withstand these conditions.

However, it is wise to be cautious in the light of the present money market conditions, unless a very compelling economic incentive is behind the decision to go for larger amounts of money. It is for this reason that the return on investment method of fixed charges evaluation, as proposed by Mr. Walton Seymour, seems to be a prudent course. It also appears advisable that the return on investment should not be below the actual cost of money, that is, at least 5.5%, so that it can bear the test of a prudent investment.

Undoubtedly, any decision based on cash flow, which might endanger the formation of equity, based on long-range predictions which cannot be ascertained under present conditions, is very risky in light of the present financial situation.

It should be noted that the Authority's coverage, which at present is in the order of 2.3 and which has been steadily increasing during the past years, is expected to dip to 1.2 with the nuclear units' expansion program.

This will not enhance the position of the Authority in the financial market in view of its large indebtedness, the present conditions of scarcity of money and a market of soaring interest rates.

The selling pattern of nuclear sales appears that the Authority's bid came out at a very unfavorable point in the nuclear sales cycle. The years 1966.

The year 1967 saw a great boom in the ordering and announcements of new nuclear units. While in 1965, nuclear sales amounted to only 27% of all the power plant additions during the year, during 1966, 63% of the total capacity announced during the year was in nuclear units. That is, a total of 22,477 megawatt electric out of an industry total of 42,573 megawatt electric. This trend slowed down during 1967, but still showed a healthy 45% of total sales and the total amount of nuclear capacity announced during the year increased to 26,460 megawatts electric. During 1968 the announcements on nuclear units declined to only 35% of the total and the amount decreased to 15,168 Mw. In the last part of the year 1968, delays, increased costs, and operating problems, especially in the nuclear units under construction, shocked the industry.

Central Station Nuclear Plants - (Ex. 3-15) AEC Division Industrial Participation - January 7, 1969 - Page Break - 29 - experience. Considerable pressure was brought at Manati by a large community group with political overtones against the establishment of a nuclear unit in the vicinity. The Authority was finally able to convince everybody of the safety aspects of nuclear units. However, these groups have a tendency to regroup and may in the future hamper or impede the establishment of nuclear units. This has happened in the United States quite a number of times.

The latest scare book, which appeared on the market in February 1969, is called "The Careless Atom" by Sheldon Novick. The book is just a recount of several well-known nuclear incidents which do not in the least reflect on the excellent safety record of nuclear power reactors. However, it has had the effect of strengthening the campaigns of enemies of nuclear reactors and it will take some time before its effects are completely eliminated.

Decommissioning of nuclear plants - Despite a proper maintenance program, a time will be reached, 30 to 50 years after initial plant operation, in which the operation of the plant is

Not economically feasible. This may be the case when the useful life of the plant is reached or due to obsolescence. When this happens in fossil plants, the dismantling of the various systems can be scheduled as if it were a construction job in reverse. The site can be cleared at a relatively low cost, and a new, modern fossil plant can be built without too many problems. In the particular case of a nuclear plant, the dismantling job should be preceded by an AEC decommissioning program, which clearly specifies the end conditions of the site. All equipment that came into contact with the primary water will be decontaminated. A decontamination program must be followed and

arrangements for removal and burial must be worked out. Although the occurrence of closing down plants is not common, it will cost much more to decommission a nuclear plant.

Average 1965 Statement of Modified Concurrent Opinion by Rafael R. Ramfrer, Justice Member, Evaluation Committee:

In its final recommendations in connection with the proposed installation of an $85,000 KW nuclear generating unit at a much higher cost than an equivalent conventional fossil-fired unit, the Evaluation Committee concluded that it is not in the best interests of the Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority at this time to undertake such a venture. I fully agree with this conclusion. Furthermore, I would like to point out that in my opinion the documents submitted in support of the nuclear unit did not cover all the factors that should have been taken into consideration in analyzing this type of unit.

Capital Cost Factors:

The estimated cost of the nuclear unit does not include the differential in regard to the land acreage that must be purchased for a nuclear unit, as compared with that needed for a conventional unit. It is a well-known fact that the nuclear unit requires a radius of half a mile or more for a safety zone within which no one will be allowed to live. The investment differential on this score could conceivably amount to

Expenses for capitalization, "deed of taxes", insurance, etc. Calculation of the margin left over interest, depreciation, contribution.

As far as installed capacity is concerned, our position at the present time is precarious. Practically all of our major generating units are of the "reheat" type, intended for 24-hour service and offering very little flexibility for daily shutdown. If we continue adding large basic generating units, especially nuclear ones, the problem of shutting down at light load will become more serious. In terms of capital costs, we would be simply replacing conventional basic generation with nuclear basic generation, at a greater original cost, just to obtain slightly lower fuel costs. We would be increasing the system's total operational cost, thus reducing the coverage margin available after the "net operating cost." This is what I call "cannibalism."

June 26, 1965

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATION

This is one of the most thorough economic evaluations ever done by PAWRA and perhaps any power utility towards the decision between nuclear or fossil-fuel generating units. Three independent studies were made. The reputable engineering consulting firms Burns & Roe and Jackson and Moreland Division of United Engineers prepared separate and independent reports. A completely independent production run cost study was performed by the Authority's Planning

Division. The final overall evaluation was prepared by a Special Committee appointed by the Executive Director, composed of the Vice Executive Director, the Assistant Executive Director for Power, Electrical Planning, Finance and Personnel, the Chief Engineer, the General Manager for Administration and Services, and the Power Consultant.

The Burns & Roe studies consist of a bid evaluation, construction estimates for nuclear and fossil-fired equivalent units, and an Evaluation Report on Two-500 Mwe Electric Generating Units B&R EW, 0, 2580-03- June 21, 1968, and a Report on 500 Mwe Power Plant - B&R#W.O. 2616-01 April 15, 1968.

Break 2. and Nuclear Fuel Studies. An economic evaluation based on given parameters was conducted. Investigations were also carried out on three nuclear units under construction and three units in operation.

(3) The Jackson and Moreland reports comprise of a bid evaluation, (4) construction cost estimates, and an investigation of operating cost parameters of similar plants. (5) Jackson and Moreland made a positive recommendation in favor of the fossil-fuel alternative.

(6) (3) Investigation and Report on Three Nuclear Stations Under Construction and Three Units in Operation - B & REW.O. 2706-02 - March 28, 1969

(4) Bid Comparison Nuclear Fueled Plants - J & M June 19, 1968

(5) Review of Factors Applying to Nuclear Unit Addition - October 1968

(6) Recommendation on Nuclear Generating Capacity for Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority - J & M - April 11, 1968

Page Break -3- The Authority conducted numerous generation expansion runs following the established planning criteria. The long-range evaluations based on the parameters which were initially chosen favored the nuclear alternative.

The Committee investigated the reasonableness of the parameters used in these studies. The fixed annual charges used by the Authority's Planning Division and by Jackson and Moreland were discussed in detail. Mr. Walton Seymour, of the Resources and Development Corporation, was invited to present his views on this point. It was agreed that the Committee would look into the economical evaluation under all valid conditions and that a recommendation for a decision would only be made after the whole range of situations were thoroughly examined.

The results of the economic studies were found to be marginal. Certain projections favored the nuclear decision, while a more fixed and conservative approach favored the fossil fuel decision. No really significant factor could be obtained which pointed with absolute certainty to any one of the criteria used in the studies. Since no definite economic advantage could be found in favor.

Page Break - Of any

One of the two alternatives over the other required a very close scrutiny of the overall situation of

nuclear units. The commercial power reactor situation at present is very confusing. A large number of utilities are backing out of their nuclear commitments because of the general tendency toward increased costs, long delays in deliveries, and additional backfitting demands on the part of the Atomic Energy Commission.

A number of utilities in the 1960s and 1970s were committed to nuclear units in what might be termed "distress sales" by all manufacturers. For example, stations such as Oyster Creek, the TVA, and Turkey Point were contracted at construction costs of around $100 per kilowatt. Nuclear power plant construction costs today are twice as much. The terms then offered were such that utilities could not refuse them and in consequence, a nuclear boom followed. The aftermath of this rush of orders was increased costs causing the slowdown on nuclear orders that we are now experiencing.

The Planning Division of the Authority has determined that the 1975 unit is no longer required as a result of the postponement of the ALCOA project. Furthermore, it is the recommendation of the Special Committee that the 1976 base load unit be a fossil-fired unit. This recommendation is based on the following reasons:

1) The economic advantages, if any, that are foreseen on the nuclear units may be offset by circumstances in the future. The optimistic nuclear forecasts have not yet materialized.

2) In the absence of clear economic advantages favoring the nuclear units, the Authority should follow the conservative attitude of continuing its present trend of fossil-fuel units expansion. The Authority and the entire power utility industry have a very solid and abundant experience on this line.

3) Since commercial experience on the large nuclear reactors will not be available until some time later in 1972, it is recommended that no further nuclear bids be issued until this experience is available and nuclear costs can be accurately assessed.

The text appears to contain multiple languages and contextless fragments, which make it difficult to correct entirely. However, I'll do my best to correct the English parts as follows:

1) "Can be reliably ascertained.
2) The Authority should continue to include nuclear units in its future expansion studies.
3) The planning process should consider nuclear units in the expansion runs, using the cost parameters obtained from past nuclear bids and information that may be obtained by closely following the experiences of others.
4) Nuclear developments should be watched very closely, as it is believed that nuclear units will eventually overcome their present difficulties and will compete economically with the present fossil-fired units used by PRWRA.
5) Although some of the parameters used by the Committee are different from those used in the Jackson & Moreland reports, the Committee agrees with the recommendations of the Consulting Engineers that a nuclear decision should not be made at this time."

Regarding the other parts of the text, I would need to know the exact language and context to provide an accurate correction.

I'm sorry, but the provided text contains multiple errors and appears to be nonsensical. It might be encrypted, corrupted, or in a different language. Could you please provide a clearer text or context so I could assist you better?

Here's the revised text:

THE SAN JUAN STAR - THE WORLD OF J DAU DE LAS FURNES FAUVIALES BE PULIEU - EL MUNDO - THE VOCERO DE PR - THE DAY OF THE NEW poet.

PONCE (AP) - Former Governor Luis A. Ferré said that when he finishes his term as President of the Senate, he will not run for any elective office, giving space to the youth. Ferré made the comment in Ponce while participating in a radio program, and jokingly commented: "I have fulfilled my obligations to Puerto Rico for eighty years and it is time to give new responsibilities to the youth".

The Founding President of the PNP will soon turn 96 years old, and he assured that he will fulfill the rest of the three years that he has left as President of the Senate. "I never shy away from responsibilities and always fulfill the obligations entrusted to me," he said.

A group of PNP leaders, especially in Ponce, have been pressuring Ferré to run in 2030 for a new term as Senator, but the former Governor was clear in his comment: "I don't think I'm ever going to be a candidate again". However, he clarified that "he will continue to be available" to help the people of Puerto Rico in advisory functions and added: "The only thing I want to continue achieving is that this is a happy people living in peace".

Ferré also announced that he will oppose the law of unionization of public employees that allows the right to strike. "Public service should not be paralyzed by anything," said Ferré. "The law that allows the unionization of public employees must contain a clause of compulsory arbitration".

He added that unionization means that workers have the opportunity to discuss collectively their needs and stated that a strike is not necessary for unionization. "We must be very careful to avoid strikes that harm public service. I will be against any law that does not guarantee the non-interruption of public services," he affirmed.

Arbitration is necessary in democratic countries, but he did not want to comment on whether.

Lo siento, pero no puedo corregir este texto ya que parece estar en un idioma extranjero mezclado y carece de coherencia y completitud. Por favor proporciona un texto más claro para que pueda ayudarte.

"Report On Energy Usage And Alternatives In Puerto Rico"

It is indeed a sad reality that today, many global communities are faced with escalating petroleum prices and imminent shortages. It is essential for these societies to assess their energy resources. For an active island community like Puerto Rico, which has no known fossil fuels of its own, recognizing the need for long-range planning in the development of alternative sources of energy is vital to continuing economic stability.

For this reason, the Governor of Puerto Rico established an Energy Office in 1972. Around the same time, the President of the University of Puerto Rico took another important step to secure the future by asking the Director of CEER to initiate an analysis of alternate energy systems and to identify the most promising, economically viable sources that might meet Puerto Rico's growing commercial needs.

CEER responded quickly to the challenge with an extensive investigation. To provide a meaningful scenario for practical development, the study's principal investigators, Modesto Arte and Rafael Sardina, projected the island's needs up to the year 2020. Potential costs were charted for the period under consideration, and to dramatize the need for alternate sources of energy, the crescendo of oil prices was also noted.

The conclusions of the comprehensive examination of Puerto Rico's options included a highly favorable endorsement of biomass. As a short-term solution, OTEC development was encouraged for the next decade. In another area, though their cost is currently too high, photovoltaics might evolve to be a significant factor by the 1980s. Wind energy is already being successfully harnessed, but of all the electrical generation systems looked at, this concept currently appears to be the least favorable in terms of initial capital investment. Wind turbines might displace oil costs, but not coal costs.

In summary, the socio-economic implications for Puerto Rico for the development of local alternative energy sources indicate benefits in the range of billions of dollars.

Annual increases in productivity and reductions in unemployment by over seven percent. Fossil Fuels - What are the right physical, chemical and biological characteristics for Enhanced Heavy Oil Recovery by microbial means? That's what this project has been attempting to find out. If we find organisms capable of releasing crude oil attached to sand or rock matrices from marginal wells or "spent wells" and we improve our knowledge of the conditions required for such release, then we can possibly design a process applicable to field conditions. To this end, during the past year, we have continued exploring micro-organisms selected from benzothiophene or high sulfur, high aromatic crude oils containing media that are effective in displacing adsorbed oil. Once good activity on natural oil-bearing minerals is found, the active organisms will be studied for laboratory growth under reservoir conditions (insofar as known) for conditions favoring optimum growth and/or gas or detergent production. Of the mixed aerobic and facultative bacterial systems studied in the release of oil absorbed to limestone, four were shown active. During their period of exposure to the organic substrate, no acid was produced ruling out oil displacement by dissolution of the matrix. Since it's obvious that limestone could not duplicate the complexity of an oil reservoir, two other oil-sand matrices, including natural ones, are currently being studied. The simplified models, however, are explored to gain some insight into the mechanism of oil displacement. Oil displacement studies were conducted by determining the released oil chemically via Anadolu 32 Mixed culture of aerobic petroleum degrading microorganisms isolated from a Venezuelan site.

The released oil was measured by dichromate oxidation. Some oils have been found to give inconsistent colors because of charring. In those cases, analytical methods such as GC or HPLC are used. Of those found active, two of them (V-2047 and V-2048) isolated from a Venezuelan underground oil reservoir were separated as pure cultures.

Identified and characterized for growth under conditions of different pH, salt concentrations, temperature, and nutrient limitations, these organisms were also found to reduce the surface tension of the growth media, indicating the presence of biopolymers or biosurfactants. The aqueous phase obtained from cultures of these organisms in the presence of Marshall crude oil is being analyzed for mutagenicity utilizing the Ames Salmonella Test. Some of the isolated microorganisms changed the composition of the oil as evidenced by the change in the aromatic/polar ratio and changes in the profile of paraffinic compounds before and after bio-treatment. Results indicate that organisms selected for their action on Dibenzothiophene can grow well on crude, while others do very poorly and are diverse in their nature and properties. We would expect the same diversity among organisms isolated for the property of releasing oil from mineral sources.

During the past year, informal agreements were reached to jointly explore with Venezuelan scientists and engineers, under DOE-Venezuela support, this area of research. Detailed work plans for further development in the complex field are currently being formulated with the participation of the Venezuelan Institute of Petroleum Technology.

Community Awareness: CCEER's Efforts in Community Awareness and Public Participation During Fiscal Year 1980, CCEER was actively involved in community awareness programs and public information-related activities in the fields of energy and the environment. CCEER scientists participated in seminars, workshops, and lectures and in an advisory capacity with a number of private and public organizations which have an interest in education, civic work, and consumers.

Important activities in these areas include technical and financial assistance to the Puerto Rico Department of Education on preparing the program "Energy Today and Tomorrow". This program is a special exhibition on the energy crisis, with emphasis on the Puerto Rican scenario, and is being presented at high schools.

Throughout the island on a daily schedule, technical advice and lectures were given by CEER scientific staff as part of the energy and environmental projects of COTACO - Worker's Committee to Aid the Consumer, a local non-profit consumer organization. One of the principal contributions was with the project "Enerso!" which consisted of lectures on energy conservation and step-by-step instructions for the construction of domestic solar water heaters.

Another activity involved the "Community Environmental Awareness Project," comprised of a series of lectures and seminars for 52 community leaders representing communities with specific environmental problems throughout the island. Lectures on energy alternatives and conservation were delivered to high school students. A one-day seminar was given for the League of Women Voters on alternatives for harnessing solar energy such as photovoltaics, biomass, OTEC, and energy conservation.

INDUSTRY: The U.S. nuclear power industry cries for help. The U.S nuclear power plant manufacturing industry may be in its death throes, says a passionate project manager of General Dynamics in San Jose, California. About two years ago, domestic orders for nuclear power plants were dwindling sharply because of falling energy demand, severe regulatory problems, and growing stress from utilities (BW-Dec 25, 1978).

Now, the export market is rising up because foreign power plant buyers are seeking alternative planning routes. However, 45 nuclear constructions, including 12 that have not traded in the past six years, are in peril unless they get new business.

In the past couple of years, Kevin App, an associate professor at Harvard's Graduate School of Business, thinks the U.S nuclear power plants are not going to get any more nuclear power plant orders in the U.S this century. He predicts foreign buyers will soon fail. All four remaining U.S. vendors have to decide whether they will continue to commit resources to an industry with growth prospects. This includes GE and Westinghouse Electric Corp, as well as Combustion.

Engineering Inc. and the Babcock & Wilcox Division of McDermott Inc. perceive potential dropouts could occur sooner rather than later. The Edison Electric Institute believes that even with U.S. energy demand growing at a steady 2% annually, the nation will still need to spend $3 billion by 1950 on new power plant construction. Much of this will presumably be nuclear. However, others think this could be overly optimistic. Harvard's Bupp, for example, figures that even without nuclear power additions beyond those planned, the electrical service margin for U.S. utilities will still be about 3.82 bushels per week.

As of April 31, 1961, even with these evaluations, there is still a question on whether to invest or not. The power units have indeed positioned U.S. chemical companies in a comparative advantage since 1915. The challenge is whether they can maintain this "stay" in the sunrise industry's "starry" market. The market for U.S. vendors is also fluctuating. More than 88% of power plants fell and have been withdrawn from U.S. manufacturers.

In total, the U.S. share of orders dwindled during this period by 30%. As of last year, U.S. manufacturers received none. This decline is due to the absence of new orders within the U.S. According to Theodore Shen, the Vice-President of Nuclear Boiler Systems for Westinghouse, there is a need to stimulate the technological advancements that the U.S. once enjoyed. Currently, four times as many nuclear orders come from the Atomic Industrial Forum.

Additionally, most overseas units are being built using foreign manufacturers' designs. France's Framatome is an example, with four Westinghouse agreements currently being converted into nuclear plant orders by Japan's Toshiba. The latter company is also cooperating with Tokyo Electric Power to develop a boiling water reactor that will be more efficient in operation than current models. They are making such progress that they might even be able to compete with the U.S. in the near future.

There are also financing hurdles to consider. Foreign governments often subsidize nuclear manufacturers, providing attractive export deals on orders or under construction. In Framatome's sale of two 900-MW reactors to South Korea last November, for example, France's Credit du Commerce Exterieur offered to finance 90% of their cost at an interest rate of only 10%. In the U.S., however, the Export-Import Bank's rates are significantly higher.

The bank is for sale and would charge 108% for secure units, of which 2 are now operating in 'avant-garde' strategies. The differential between the US and French terms on an $16 billion loan could easily top $500 million over the life of the project.

All manufacturers are from nuclear power plants that were once the mainstay of many daring enterprises. The atomic interest is not only in bonds but also in the power sector. Westinghouse was such that France may seize an opportunity to knock out much of the global competition and dominate the power plant industry.

These units, where power production might be part of the phase of our exports, are now being prepared by France for sale to its buyers. Despite President Francois Mitterrand's commitment to France's domestic atomic program, French foreign trade officials say that they will compete in the US market for export sales.

Mitterrand has led the drive to sell French nuclear technology to developing countries, increasing from 0.5% to 0.7% of his government's regular budget on this goal. US power plant vendors await a similar gesture from the US Export-Import Bank in the form of export aid.

The survival of US nuclear power plant manufacturers may heavily depend on an international agreement such as the one worked out evenly between the US, France, Britain, and West Germany to limit international export loans to 12%. This will not solve the domestic nuclear industry's fundamental long-term problems at home.

The last four builders may have to quit a business that is getting no orders due to a detailed process, including a design review for a construction permit and an operating license. This time-consuming process means it takes about 12 years for a new nuclear plant to be put into commercial operation in the US, double the time it took a decade ago and double the time it now takes abroad.

The industry has long argued for changes in processing rules, but it is obviously hard to make changes in Washington, particularly when it is considered unnecessary.

This is a provision of the Atomic Energy Act.

The text seems to be a mix of English and Spanish and it's quite scrambled, and not making much sense. Here's an attempt to clean it up, but I'm afraid there's a lot of missing context and I might not capture the intended meaning:

Dear Mr. Miranda,

In our past Ordinary Assembly, the College of Engineers, Architects of Puerto Rico studied the problem related to the establishment of Nuclear Power Plants as an alternative to the solution of the energy problem in August 1975, and the Ageisensores ion Special for This Commission has determined that it needs to obtain certain information and data that allow it to evaluate this difficult problem. Therefore, we respectfully request that your agency make a presentation on these aspects to this Commission as soon as possible. We suggest any Monday, Tuesday or Wednesday during the month of November. Among the information we would need from your Agency in this presentation would be the following:

Generating capacity to be in operation for the year 1985.

Type and capacity of each power plant to be installed during those years. ---Page"

Nunca usted una Comisión Investigadora compuesta de los siguientes miembros: Ing. Rafael Cruz Pérez, Presidente Agrim, Juan Arvelo Diaz Arq. Fernando Irizarry Rodriguez, Ing. José E. Antowatte Cruz, Ing. Alfredo Herrez Gonzalez, Ing. Juan G. Muriel Figueras, Ing. José E. Deliz Alvarez, Ing. Nanuet Marquez Rivers, Ing. Guillermo Pérez Martínez, Ing. Carlos Rady Guerra. Esta Comisión celebró un sinnúmero de reuniones con el propósito de cumplir con el requerimiento de la Resolución incluyendo una vista pública para los miembros de este Colegio y varias reuniones con agencias y personas instruidas en este campo. La vista pública fue celebrada el sábado 18 de octubre de 1975 en el Colegio de Ingenieros, Arquitectos y Agrimensores donde depusieron las siguientes personas: Ing. Juan José Sánchez, Arq. Gonzalo Fernés, Dr. Donald Sesser, Dr. Juan A. Bonnet. Luego de encontrarnos en etapa avanzada, la Autoridad de las Fuentes Fluviales determinó e hizo saber públicamente la suspensión de sus actividades en el campo de la energía nuclear por tiempo indefinido. La Autoridad de las Fuentes Fluviales indicó como razón básica para esta proposición, que Puerto Rico no necesita una planta nuclear por los próximos diez años (1985); y que el alto costo del proyecto requeriría unos financiamientos demasiado altos para las circunstancias del mercado actual y de Puerto Rico. Se indicó además, que la Autoridad continuará explorando otros alternativos que le permitan proveer energía eléctrica que represente costos más bajos en las tarifas de energía. Dada esta situación nuestra Comisión determinó el no continuar con los trabajos sobre plantas nucleares. Aún así y ya que a través de las reuniones, vistas y entrevistas contamos con algunos datos sobre la problemática energética, se consideró pertinente el investigar la situación energética en Puerto Rico más a fondo y el impacto que esta situación pudiera tener en nuestro Colegio. De nuestras investigaciones... (Texto incompleto)

En ocasiones surgen varios hechos sorprendentes y retóricos, los cuales pueden tener un impacto decisivo sobre el futuro económico, político y social de nuestra isla. Puerto Rico depende casi en un 100% de energía producida por combustible fósil para satisfacer sus necesidades. Este combustible fósil proviene en su totalidad de fuera de Puerto Rico, de unos países que cuentan con la mayor parte de las reservas mundiales de este producto. Se conocen unas reservas de combustibles fósiles en el mundo que de continuar su utilización al ritmo actual consumirían todo este petróleo en el plazo de una generación.

Actualmente no existe una alternativa tecnológica que por si sola pueda sustituir ni siquiera una parte significativa del petróleo que es utilizado como combustible. La energía nuclear aún tiene un vacío en tecnología lo cual no ha permitido que esta llegue a ser el sustituto del petróleo. Sin embargo, creemos que es totalmente factible, que se pueda lograr en un futuro no lejano el desarrollo de energía nuclear limpia, segura y eficiente, y por tanto debemos fomentar un programa de planificación energética tendiente hacia el desarrollo futuro de esta fuente de energía.

Luego de considerar las principales alternativas para uso de energía, podemos concluir que en base a la tecnología presente, la producción de energía eléctrica en cantidades significativas o económicamente factibles por medio de fuentes tales como la energía solar y la fusión nuclear se encuentran de veinte a treinta años en el futuro. Si consideramos que dado el valor finito de las reservas de petróleo en el mundo, el precio de este continuará incrementándose, y ante los

conocimientos y desarrollos tecnológicos actuales, y de no haber un hallazgo inesperado nos queda como única alternativa realista y comercialmente viable de aquí al 1995 el utilizar la energía nuclear, o de otro modo el reducir considerablemente nuestro estándar de vida actual. El conjunto de estos problemas nos encamina en donde se encuentra nuestra energía en el futuro.

The text appears to be in Spanish but it's heavily garbled and contains numerous spelling errors, making it challenging to translate and correct accurately. Here's my best attempt:

"Cuenta con años hablar y escribir cientos de páginas acerca de aquel sin esfuerzo, entendiendo que uno de los factores principales para la crisis que enfrentamos es que se ha dicho mucho y se ha hecho poco para resolver nuestros problemas. Reconocemos que el Colegio de Ingenieros, Arquitectos y demás áreas, además de fomentar las investigaciones en desarrollo, tiene una participación activa en la persecución de soluciones y la acción positiva de nuestros colegiados en esta dirección. La acción de esta comisión es la siguiente: Que el Colegio de Ingenieros, Arquitectos y Agrimensores cree una comisión permanente y asegure los fondos necesarios que permitan las siguientes tareas:

1. Que se inicien las actividades indicadas en los puntos 1 y 3 de la Resolución A-004 del 1975, que dicen: (1) "Que el Colegio de Ingenieros, Arquitectos y Agrimensores de Puerto Rico, establezca un programa de orientación al pueblo sobre la alternativa del uso de la energía nuclear como fuente de energía. (3) Que el C.I.A.A. comparezca a través de su Presidente o de los representantes autorizados por el mismo, a todas las vistas públicas relacionadas con estos proyectos de centrales nucleares para Puerto Rico a presentar a nombre del Colegio el contenido de esta resolución."
2. La revisión de los códigos de construcción, para que reflejen medidas de conservación de energía en las obras a construirse en Puerto Rico.
3. El fomento a través de instituciones privadas y públicas o de ser necesario el propio Colegio de la investigación de fuentes alternas de energía, tales como sol, mareas, viento, etc.
4. El ofrecimiento de cursos cortos y consecutivos a colegiados en la práctica de la profesión sobre las medidas de conservación de energía, tecnología desarrollada y posibilidades de investigación.

10. a. 1. 1B. Bruno. Ay, es posible. An economic and social analysis; a study in industrial and regional economic development; W. Isard, U. Whitney, N.Y., Bulliston."

1952, Bosiet, O. J. "The EF Whitey, 1973: Components of Nuclear Power," N.Y. Conference on Nuclear Energy, Public Policy and the Law, New York University, 1963. Editor E. A. Blovschin, School of Law. 1. Atomic Power- Law & essays, lectures, station - U.S. Address. 2. Atomic Power Industry - U.S. - Addresses, essays, lectures. Dugger, Gordon L., editor; Proceedings Third Workshop on Ocean. Thermal Energy Conversion, Houston, Texas, May 1975. Dugger, Gordon L.; U.S. Congress Vol. 21.-No.38 (9/22/75) A hearing on the Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant Fire by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. Book of the atomic energy industry, Editor S. Jefferson, N.Y. Pitman Pub. Corp. 1958. Hogerton, John. The Atomic Energy Deskbook. N.Y., Reinhold Pub. Corp. 1963. International Conference on the Peaceful Use of Atomic Energy 1st Geneva Congress, 1955. International Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy, 3rd. Geneva, 1964. Inter-American Symposium on the Peaceful Applications of Nuclear Energy. 5th. Valparaiso, Chile, 1964. Washington, Pan American Union, 1965. Jaro Fsyda. Energía Nuclear y derecho: Simposio

Inter-americano U.P. R. 1966. Journal of Nuclear Energy - Revista - Pergamon Press August 1959 - June 1959. Payne A. The prospects for nuclear Energy in P.R., Washington National Planning Association, 1958.

6. 6 wv 1B. 19. 2. 23. 25, 26. a. 28. bgeat ta) (2) Nuclear Energy Centers, U.S. National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tenn. Nuclear Energy Centers: Industrial and agro-industrial complexes; Oak Ridge National Laboratory managed by Union Carbide for the U.S. Atomic Energy Center, Year in Industry, 1995, N.Y., Pitman Pub. Corp. Nuclear Safety - Sept. 59. Marsh! U.S. Government Printing Office, Indexes: “Vol 1-3, 1999"= June 1952. Nuclear Energy: 2) Radioactivity - Safety measures = period areas - period crt, B.C. Atomic Energy Application, with reference to 'developed countries' - a preliminary survey. Baltimore, John Hopkins Press, 1987. Office for Economy, Cooperation, and Development. European Nuclear Energy Agency. Nuclear Legislation: analytical study.

Organization and General Regime of Nuclear Activities (Paris) O.F.C.D. 1959 Reactor Fuel Processing 1968 - Atomic Energy Co: Fission Reaction, A. Introduction to Nuclear Power Costs N.Y., Sissons & Brandman, Publisher Co., 1959 Shilling, C.W.M. (editor) Atomic Energy Encyclopedia in the Life Sciences. Philadelphia, W.B. Saunders Co., 1964. Schutte, S.H. (editor) (Translated into Spanish) Plan Economics of Atomic Power, An exploratory study under direction of S.H. Schutter & J. Herschel Cowles Commission for Research in Economics. Princeton University Press, 1950 Tertium, P.O. Nuclear energy and the U.S. fuel economy, 1955 -1960. Washington National Planning Association, 1958. 1. Products and Uses of Nuclear Energy U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. Atomic energy facts; a summary, 1957. U.S. Government Printing Office U.S. Atomic Energy Commission Report 23rd. - 1958. U.S. Government Printing Office U.S. P.R. Nuclear Center, Vasquez - Synopsis on Nuclear Energy and the Development of L.A, Oct 30-31 1967. Editorial U.P.R. 1969.

2 (Be it known that) (3) Costs and Feasibility of Energy with Penny, 19 Location Approval, Draft Environmental Statement, June 25, 1973 Tennessee Statement, B.A., w/o Shy Atomic Power Dims Today; Business + Spy, Nov 9, 1975. Etc. Alche, Position paper on the need for, and safety of, Uranium Power, December 1975 plan, Electricity Corporation for 1975, Mechanics Book, 1978 Reactor Safety Study. An assessment of Accident Risks in U.S. Nuclear Power Plants, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, August 1974 A Report on the Brown's Ferry Nuclear Plant Fire by the Joint Committee on Safe Energy. U.S. Congress, Vol. 21 - No. 38, (9/22/75).