

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C O M P L E X 2 0 3 0  
Supplemental Programmatic  
Environmental Impact Statement

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

National Nuclear Security Administration  
Department of Energy

DECEMBER 6, 2006  
6:00 p.m.  
Genoveva Chavez Community Center  
Santa Fe, New Mexico

REPORTED BY: MABEL JIN CHIN, NM CCR #81  
Bean & Associates, Inc.  
Professional Court Reporting Service  
500 Marquette, Northwest, Suite 280  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

(2499A) MC

1 SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO, DECEMBER 6, 2006, 7:48 P.M.  
2  
3 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Okay. We're ready  
4 to go, would you take your seats, please?

5           While you are taking your seats let me read  
6 into the record my formal comments.

7           Welcome back. I will now read into the  
8 record for the verbatim transcription my introductory  
9 remarks. This portion of our meeting is officially  
10 designated as the Santa Fe Public Meeting for the  
11 National Nuclear Security Administration Supplemental  
12 PEIS for Complex 2030 program. This meeting is being  
13 held on December 6, 2006 in the Genoveva Chavez  
14 Community Center. It is being held to receive  
15 comments on the scope of this PEIS. We are commencing  
16 the comment, public comment portion of this meeting at  
17 7:50 p.m. and are scheduled to adjourn once all  
18 participants have had a chance to make their  
19 comments. Each speaker will have a maximum of five  
20 minutes. Anything less than that will get a gold  
21 star.

22           I told you we have 32 or 33 speakers. It's  
23 now up to 40, so you can imagine we're going to be  
24 here for a while. So I am going to be enforcing that  
25 pretty severely, and I really appreciate your

3

1 cooperati on.

2           This meeting was preceded by a presentati on  
3 by NNSA's PEIS Document Manager Mr. Ted Wyka.  
4 Mr. Wyka will represent NNSA in listening to and  
5 accepting your comments right here.

6           For the record, again, my name is Barry  
7 Lawson of Barry Lawson Associates. I have been asked  
8 by the NNSA to conduct this comment period as an  
9 independent and neutral moderator. I will ensure that

10 the ground rules we reviewed earlier in the meeting  
11 are followed, and this approach is in keeping with  
12 both the letter and the spirit of the National  
13 Environmental Policy Act.

14 Our court reporter this evening is Mabel  
15 Chin. Mabel is -- has -- her task, sorry, is to  
16 create a complete and accurate transcription of this  
17 meeting. The verbatim transcript of all comments  
18 received tonight will be included at NNSA's records of  
19 these proceedings. The administration will place  
20 copies of the transcript from this and other public  
21 meetings in its Freedom of Information Act designated  
22 reading rooms as soon as practicable.

23 If you wish to make comments tonight you  
24 must have first signed up at the registration table,  
25 and obviously many of you have done that. I will

4

1 recognize speakers in the order in which they have  
2 been registered. Please remain in this room if you  
3 are scheduled to speak. I will be calling three,  
4 three speakers at a time, the current speaker and then  
5 two follow-up speakers, so that the two will have some  
6 warning before you are to speak.

7 Now, we have some empty seats up front here,  
8 so if your name is called as one of the three speakers  
9 or the third speaker, if you could come up to the  
10 front it will save just that much more time again.  
11 When it is your turn to speak, would you please come  
12 forward to the podium over there to my left. This  
13 will help the court reporter make an accurate record  
14 of your comments.

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

15           If you are approaching the time limit of  
16 five minutes, I will give a signal, and I'm going to  
17 try to give a signal like this so I don't have to  
18 interrupt. So you may not see it over there. If you  
19 don't, I will have to speak up, and I don't want to  
20 interrupt anybody, but sometimes I may have to do  
21 that. I apologize in advance. I would then ask you  
22 to summarize your remaining comments as quickly and as  
23 gracefully as possible.

24           As I mentioned, I may call a break or recess  
25 of the proceedings to give the court reporter and all

5

1 of us a break, and I think that probably will come  
2 basically every hour, and I will try to announce that  
3 two or three speakers in advance.

4           Commenters are recommended to state their  
5 name for the court reporter record. When you're  
6 speaking, if you have a written copy of your  
7 testimony, or if you have a written document that you  
8 would like to submit as an exhibit, please bring it to  
9 me after you have spoken. Written materials then will  
10 be formally accepted into the record of this meeting,  
11 in addition to the oral comments, and each is weighted  
12 equally by NNSA.

13           I think we are ready to begin. I know a lot  
14 of people here, a lot of people are standing in the  
15 back. That's fine. If you find that it's important  
16 for you to have a conversation with somebody, I would  
17 ask you if you could just step outside so that we  
18 don't have interference. It's important for the court  
19 reporter to be able to hear it, but it's also

20 important for other people in the room to be able to  
21 hear the comments of the meeting made by the folks.

22           Okay. Thank you for your patience. Our  
23 first speaker is Kip Corneli, and he would be followed  
24 by Penelope McMullen and William Christison.  
25 Mr. Corneli, please.

6

1           MR. KIP CORNELI: Good evening, Ladies and  
2 gentlemen of the DOE and friends in the audience. My  
3 name is Kip Corneli. I'm a veteran of World War II,  
4 Normandy Landing D plus 30, service in combat, Army  
5 Combat Engineers across France and Germany, discharged  
6 in January 1946 when I was 20. I am speaking on  
7 behalf of about 140 members of the Local Joan Duffy  
8 Chapter of our Veterans for Peace Organization.

9           A nuclear weapons production in our state is  
10 due to reach a new alarming intensity with the  
11 increase proposed by you, the DOE. You intend a  
12 massive reorganization of the 1966 stockpile  
13 stewardship and management PEIS with Complex 2030.  
14 This plan will ramp up nuclear weapon production  
15 because you judge our existing weapons to be no longer  
16 efficient or sufficient enough in numbers. But please  
17 note some observations I would like to make.

18           Just last week, I think it was, an  
19 organization that you are associated with very closely  
20 announced that the life of pits is now thought to be  
21 at somewhere around twice as long as it was originally  
22 thought. So we have about 70 years of rational  
23 democratically arrived nuclear decisions. I hope  
24 we'll not try to rush too fast towards 2030. How long

25 will it take you to catch up with where the NPT, the

7

1 nonproliferation treaty said we should be on  
2 dismantling our own and Soviet or Russian weapons?  
3 Can you spend a good sum of the effort that you are  
4 now spending around the country to tell us about a, I  
5 believe, purposely confused and complicated 2030  
6 project, and spend half that effort on convincing  
7 other bomb-owning nations to dismantle their weapons?  
8 We need to start now and backburn the 2030 complex.

9           Some reasonable alternatives, you have asked  
10 for them tonight on the screen. Number one,  
11 accelerate the dismantling of domestic and foreign  
12 weapons. Study and arrive at reasonable weapon  
13 numbers worldwide, with the U.S. in the lead. Bend  
14 every effort towards the total elimination of nuclear  
15 weapons by, shall we say, 2030. Consider -- consider  
16 and publicize widely our constitutional response under  
17 the nuclear nonproliferation treaty -- our response  
18 and our responsibilities, if you please.

19           I heard nothing much tonight about -- about  
20 -- about elimination of this and moving towards a  
21 peaceful, successfully living world.

22           Two more shortcomings. Our Veterans for  
23 Peace chapter, named after Vietnam Army Nurse Joan  
24 Duffy, who died just this fall from exposure to Agent  
25 Orange while she was a nurse in Vietnam, our chapter

8

1 urges that this 2030 capability not be implemented.  
2 We do not want our legacy to future generations to be  
3 a wasted world, an improperly spent national treasury.

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

4           Mason Lowe of the Alliance for Nuclear  
5   Accountability expresses a practical, concern. "Given  
6   DOE's track record, the new bombplex," as he calls it,  
7   "will soar over its budget, whatever the high number  
8   that gets to be, and will still not achieve its  
9   goals." Now, that's his opinion. Indeed, we, the  
10  people, don't even want -- we don't even want the DOE  
11  to try this project.

12           As Thomas Jefferson said, and I'm  
13  paraphrasing, an informed -- an informed public is  
14  essential to maintaining order in our republic. And  
15  when government officials put things awry, the people  
16  can be counted on to set them right.

17           Thank you from the members of the local  
18  veterans group.

19           MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you,  
20  Mr. Corneli. The next speaker is Penelope McMullen  
21  and she will be followed by William Christison and Bob  
22  Forrester.

23           Ms. McMullen, please.

24           MS. PENELOPE McMULLEN: I am Penelope  
25  McMullen and have lived in Santa Fe for 20 years. I'm

9

1  a Sister of Loretto, and our community has been  
2  serving the people of New Mexico for 154 years. I am  
3  the regional --

4           FROM THE FLOOR: Louder, please.

5           MS. PENELOPE McMULLEN: Do I need to  
6  repeat?

7           MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: You can go ahead.  
8  I adjust it over here.

9 MS. PENELOPE McMULLEN: I'm the Regional  
10 Justice and Peace Coordinator for the Loretto  
11 community which consist of sisters and comembers, and  
12 I am authorized to speak for the community nationwide  
13 at this hearing.

14 The NNSA claims that they have to replace  
15 old plutonium pits because they age, in order to  
16 maintain current stockpiles of weapons. However, a  
17 recently completed five-year study of pit aging has  
18 revealed that most pits will remain reliable for at  
19 least 85 years, and possibly more than a century,  
20 therefore, replacing the pits is totally unnecessary.

21 Given the study's result about aging pits,  
22 which constitute a large part of this Complex plan,  
23 NNSA should withdraw the current notice of intent,  
24 reconsider the complex, rewrite the proposal, if not  
25 totally discard it, and then call for new scoping

10

1 hearings. And of course, the new plan would not  
2 include replacing pits. While rewriting the plan the  
3 new proposal needs to comply with the nonproliferation  
4 treaty which the United States ratified and which  
5 commits us to dismantling our nuclear weapons in a  
6 timely manner and forbids that we produce new nuclear  
7 weapons.

8 For two decades now, polls have shown that  
9 80 percent of the U.S. citizens want our nation to  
10 honor the nonproliferation treaty and dismantle our  
11 nuclear weapons. The EIS needs to consider the  
12 consequences of continuing to violate the  
13 nonproliferation treaty.



12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

19 include all alternatives, not just the ones that DOE  
20 would like to see happen or continue. There is the  
21 alternative of nuclear disarmament. There is the  
22 alternative of turning our attention to the serious  
23 consequences of global warming and seeking remedies  
24 before it is too late. There is the alternative of  
25 having the great minds of this nation work on

12

1 developing renewable energy. It has been suggested  
2 that instead of having a Complex 2030, we instead plan  
3 an energyplex 2030.

4           There is the alternative of diplomacy, in  
5 making other nations our friends. We would not have  
6 the problem of Iraq now if we had used our funds and  
7 personnel to help get food to those who are hungry, to  
8 build houses and schools, to provide medical care and  
9 respond to basic human needs. We would have turned  
10 them from being enemies to being our friends.

11           There is a well-known Native American story  
12 about a man who murdered a member of another tribe.  
13 The aggrieved tribe, instead of seeking misnomered  
14 justice, invited the murderer in and told him he had  
15 to take the place of the man who was no longer with  
16 them. They showered him with gifts to welcome him  
17 into the tribe, and that healed his heart as well as  
18 making both tribes more safe. We could learn much  
19 from that enlightened tribe. Thank you.

20           MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you.

21           Our next speaker is William Christison  
22 followed by Bob Forrester and Chad Twitchell.

23           Now I don't know if everyone was in the room

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

24 when I announced that I am announcing three names at a  
25 time so that you will know who is on deck and who will

13

1 go following the on deck person. We have some seats  
2 up here, and to save a little bit of time, once you  
3 have heard your name, to come up here so you will be  
4 prepared.

5 Mr. Christison is now, so Mr. Christison  
6 will be followed by Bob Forrester and Chad Twitchell.  
7 Are both of those gentlemen here? You're right  
8 there. Mr. Christison, please.

9 MR. WILLIAM CHRISTISON: My name is William  
10 Christison. I have lived here in town for 27 years.  
11 Prior to that I worked for the CIA, Central  
12 Intelligence Agency, and one of my tasks was to  
13 participate in the drafting of various national  
14 intelligence estimates on the problem of global  
15 nuclear proliferation. I note in the ground rules for  
16 public comment tonight is the statement, please limit  
17 your comments to the scope of the Complex 2030 PEIS.  
18 And elsewhere, in one of the documents that you passed  
19 out, is the statement, "An Environmental Impact  
20 Statement is required for any major federal action  
21 that may significantly affect the quality of the human  
22 environment, and this Supplemental Environmental  
23 Impact Statement now being looked upon builds on an  
24 earlier Environmental Impact Statement and will  
25 include a thorough up-to-date analysis."

14

1 I would like to point out to all of you that

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

2 in none of the documents passed out this evening that  
3 I had the opportunity to read is the word disarmament  
4 even mentioned, not once.

5           Earlier speakers have talked about the  
6 nuclear nonproliferation treaty that was ratified by  
7 the United States 36 years ago, and that treaty calls  
8 for the United States and other nuclear powers to  
9 negotiate seriously for nuclear global disarmament.  
10 Don't you really think that any environmental impact  
11 statement should, among its alternatives, have one on  
12 the subject of what would be the environmental impact,  
13 favorable or not, of global nuclear disarmament? I  
14 think it should.

15           Now, in addition to that, we have these  
16 detailed papers, one already produced sometime  
17 earlier, a new Supplemental Environmental Impact  
18 Statement starting to be produced right now. I would  
19 submit to you that we do not need any new statement  
20 and we should discard the old statement, which is  
21 admittedly way out of date, until we know what the  
22 plans of the U.S. government are to produce more  
23 nuclear weapons. Obviously there are numerous plans,  
24 all of them aimed in the direction of producing more  
25 nuclear weapons, not a one of them aimed at seriously

15

1 negotiating global nuclear disarmament. That is a  
2 tragedy. It is something we should not allow to  
3 happen, and I, for one, express my own opinion here  
4 tonight that there should be no new environmental  
5 impact statement, and the one that is presently in  
6 existence, the earlier one be declared null and void

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

7 here and now, because it is no longer applicable, and  
8 that any new environmental impact statement should be  
9 based on a firm knowledge of what the plans of a given  
10 U.S. administration are to develop new nuclear  
11 weapons, and that one of the alternatives that must be  
12 looked at seriously, not as a joke -- which, by the  
13 way, I have to say I think much of this meeting is --  
14 they should be -- our nuclear plans should include an  
15 alternative, in all cases, for serious negotiations on  
16 global disarmament. Thank you very much.

17 MR. BOB FORREST: My name is Bob Forrest.

18 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Excuse me one  
19 second. I have to announce another person. Thank  
20 you, Mr. Christison.

21 It's Bob Forrest, isn't it?

22 MR. BOB FORREST: Yes.

23 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Not Forrester, and  
24 I need to call Chad Twitchell and Jim Conca. Thank  
25 you. Please.

16

1 MR. BOB FORREST: He was mispronouncing my  
2 name, and I am the Mayor from Carlsbad, New Mexico. I  
3 thought, well, maybe just leave it as Forrester. They  
4 won't recognize me. But I'm the Mayor, and I just  
5 want to tell you, I appreciate all of these hearings  
6 and letting us come up from Carlsbad and have our  
7 input. And I want to thank the NNSA for holding these  
8 hearings. You know, I wish there wasn't a drum of  
9 waste out there, and I know what you think of Carlsbad  
10 sometimes, and what's going on and -- 35 years ago the  
11 Atomic Energy came to Carlsbad and sat down and talked

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

12 with the leaders of the community and said, we have a  
13 terrible problem out there with this transuranic waste  
14 and other types of waste, and we have done a lot of  
15 studies, and we feel like that the salt beds might be  
16 the best place to put it, and we would like for the  
17 city to step forward and do a trial basis, and call it  
18 a pilot project. We'll move along and in the first  
19 five years if you feel like it's a project that you  
20 don't like, and if you feel like it's unsafe, that you  
21 cancel and we'll go back to Washington and you go back  
22 to doing what you were doing.

23           And in the area we have about five or six  
24 potash mines and that, if you know very much about the  
25 geology of the area, have been in the area for 60 to

17

1 70 years. We got the mine superintendents together  
2 and told them about what we were trying to do in  
3 Carlsbad and what was the reaction of salt, and how to  
4 entomb, and they said, well, everything that the  
5 Atomic Energy is saying is true, and that began the  
6 process of WIPP. We went through all the hearings, we  
7 jumped through all the hoops, we came up to Santa Fe,  
8 and I can remember the hearings at the Sweeney hall,  
9 and the number one issue was the transportation. How  
10 are you going to haul this stuff? It's going to  
11 decrease the values of our property when those trucks  
12 come down the street.

13           And I am happy to tell you today that the  
14 transportation system, I think it hardly is on the  
15 radar screen. We have got state-of-the-art trucks,  
16 satellite controls, two drivers,

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

17 100,000-mile-free-accident, we have got TRU pack  
18 containers, there was a square box designed in the 19-  
19 -- in the late '90s -- or early '90s, excuse me, a  
20 gentleman by the name of Bob Wheel with the EEG came  
21 to Carlsbad and demanded that DOE go to the cylinder  
22 container. They spent another 42 million dollars and  
23 we have come back with a TRU pack facility and the TRU  
24 pack trucking system, and I think we have a  
25 state-of-the-art.

18

1 We jumped through every hoop. 30 days ago  
2 Bill Richardson came to Carlsbad, and we got the RH  
3 permit. I have been to over 200 hearings, and I think  
4 we're doing the right thing. And when you look back  
5 at the history of Carlsbad and you say, 35 years ago  
6 would you have changed this? I don't think so. I  
7 think the people of Carlsbad feel very safe. This  
8 project is working.

9 And at this time I would like to invite the  
10 NNSA to open Carlsbad and maybe the WIPP site to  
11 consider it for one of the sites in the CP Center that  
12 is coming with this project. That I don't like  
13 nuclear weapons any better than you do. I think it's  
14 something I'm sorry that we have to have. I'm a  
15 fourth-generation New Mexican. I have lived in New  
16 Mexico all my life. I love this state. I love our  
17 town. I love our area. And I wouldn't do anything  
18 that would deter the safety and the quality of life  
19 that we have. But there are some problems facing us,  
20 and this waste and these problems that we have with  
21 nuclear weapons is one of them. And I think we need

22 to continue for the apparent reasons. And we support  
23 the pit project. The community, we have had over 10  
24 public hearings when the moderate pit facility came to  
25 town two years ago, and we're here requesting the NNSA

19

1 to open the scope of communities to one more and  
2 include the WIPP site.

3 And I want to thank you, and I want to thank  
4 you for the courtesy that you have shown me tonight.  
5 I know you are sitting there, bit your tongues and  
6 everything, but I just want you to know that we're  
7 very much a part of New Mexico and very proud of what  
8 we're doing. It's a job someone's got to do, and I  
9 think if everybody says not in my back yard, that  
10 isn't the answer. But when you can stand here and  
11 look up at Los Alamos and see thousands of drums  
12 sitting on asphalt pads 20 miles away, I think it's  
13 better to have it 2,100 feet underground in salt beds.

14 And we didn't create the problem. We're  
15 just part of the solution. And I think that we have  
16 done a good job, and it's not an easy job. I wish we  
17 didn't have to deal with this. But we have stepped  
18 forward, and I think the same process that we did with  
19 WIPP can be done with the CPC project. Again, thank  
20 you very much.

21 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you, sir.

22 Next speaker is Chad Twitchell. He will be  
23 followed by Jim Conca and Bud Ryan.

24 MR. CHAD TWITCHELL: My name is Chad  
25 Twitchell. I am grateful that I live in a nation that

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

1 has democratic process, where my opinion and the  
2 ability to express my opinion is held equal to anyone  
3 else in the room. I am grateful to have the  
4 opportunity to be here. And -- I believe that this  
5 nation needs the nuclear deterrent. And I believe  
6 that that deterrent has saved us from much worse  
7 consequences worldwide. I look at what's happening in  
8 the world, and particularly two countries right now,  
9 where the threat of nuclear proliferation is very  
10 real. There are leaders of countries bent on  
11 developing that capability and using it. And I am  
12 sorry that that's the case, but it is the case. I  
13 believe that we must have the capability to continue  
14 to have a nuclear capability and to manufacturer these  
15 weapons. So I would recommend, as I have reviewed the  
16 EIS, that the NNSA is on the right track to  
17 consolidate the complex. I think it reduces the risk  
18 of an accident.

19 I also think that Carlsbad should be  
20 considered as a possibility for the Consolidated  
21 Plutonium Center. Any waste generated from pit  
22 production will need to go to a repository and the  
23 Waste Isolation Pilot Plant is currently the only  
24 licensed deep geologic repository in the world. I  
25 would like NNSA to explain to me and to the citizens

21

1 of Carlsbad why it has not been placed on the list of  
2 potential sites. With land in DOE possession and the  
3 capability of two national laboratories in the city,  
4 it seems a reasonable and logical solution, given the  
5 stated goal of the Complex 2030 proposal, to be

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

6 operational efficiency, Carlsbad must be considered  
7 from a cost of operations standpoint long-term to make  
8 sense.

9 WIPP is a critical resource to the NNSA, and  
10 I think it should be considered as part of their  
11 deliberations.

12 Our remote location in the southeast part of  
13 the state adds to our ability to be able to keep it  
14 secure, adds to the ability to have a safe facility.  
15 I would ask that the NNSA please seriously consider  
16 building the CPC in Southeast New Mexico, communities  
17 that support WIPP, have been unfailing in that  
18 support.

19 We cannot understand why Carlsbad is not  
20 being considered and request that the PEIS and EIS be  
21 revised to include it as a possibility. We believe  
22 the responsive infrastructure can and should include  
23 the possibility of using Southeast New Mexico, and  
24 that we believe that can be done without adding  
25 significant additional government costs or additional

22

1 sites under proposal one, alternative two of the EIS.  
2 The scope is incorrectly defined as of now, and should  
3 be expanded to include a tract in Southeast New  
4 Mexico.

5 I would add parenthetically that I believe  
6 the proposals two and three, as I saw slight  
7 hesitation, are appropriate based on the review that I  
8 have done.

9 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: May I ask you to  
10 summarize your final comments, please?

11 MR. CHAD TWITCHELL: We believe that the  
12 southern part of the state is a viable alternative to  
13 the LANL alternative, where it is obvious it has  
14 limited public support, certainly at this meeting. If  
15 this meeting were to be held in Carlsbad, it would be  
16 significantly different in tone and tenor, as we have  
17 seen in public meetings similar to this one in the  
18 past. Thank you.

19 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you.

20 Next speaker is Jim Conca, to be followed by  
21 Bud Ryan and Greg Mello.

22 MR. JIM CONCA: Hello. My name is Dr. James  
23 Conca, and my concerns center on safety and security  
24 in the environment. I'm Director of the CEMRC  
25 Radiochemistry Facility in Carlsbad at New Mexico

23

1 State University, which for the past ten years has  
2 been the independent monitoring facility for the WIPP  
3 nuclear Repository in Carlsbad. We have the most  
4 sensitive, most complete radiological monitoring  
5 capabilities in the world, and because of our efforts,  
6 WIPP is the only nuclear facility with the before and  
7 after on the citizens and the workers and the  
8 environment.

9 This Consolidated Plutonium Center deserves  
10 no less than to be monitored adequately. Couple that  
11 with the fact that WIPP and Pantex, the two end points  
12 in the pit cycle, and WIPP becomes an obvious choice  
13 for the site.

14 Plutonium used in the production of the pit  
15 ultimately must go to two sites and only two sites,

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

16 the Pantex and WIPP. The pits must go to Pantex and  
17 the waste must go to WIPP. Siting the CPC at WIPP  
18 results in the shortest transportation path and the  
19 greater safety and security to the nuclear materials.  
20 As all vulnerability analyses show, transportation is  
21 the weak link, and as a dirt bomb expert, I know that  
22 it's easier to secure a fixed facility than to secure  
23 a transporting one.

24 If this facility is sited at WIPP, then the  
25 nuclear waste produced does not have to be transported

24

1 at all, does not have to be on the road. And the pits  
2 themselves only travel about a six-hour drive to  
3 Pantex. Therefore, only the equivalent of a  
4 bathtubfull of nuclear materials need to be on the  
5 road each year if sited at WIPP. Siting at any other  
6 location results in orders of magnitude, more nuclear  
7 material on the roads each year. Even siting the  
8 facility in Pantex does not provide such an advantage.

9 From the standpoint of economics, community  
10 support, physical location, technical capability,  
11 environmental waste issues, and let's face it, track  
12 record, the region around WIPP is second to none.

13 So I am surprised that WIPP is not even being  
14 considered in this go round, and I ask the NNSA why.  
15 If you want this center to be done right, to be done  
16 on time and done on budget, you need to consider  
17 siting it at WIPP, and it fits very well into the  
18 concepts of responsive infrastructure.

19 So I urge you to consider WIPP as a site and  
20 to add it to the list. Thank you.

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

21 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you, sir.  
22 All right. Next speaker is Bud Ryan, to be  
23 followed by Greg Mello and Linda Wiener.  
24 MR. BUD RYAN: Hi. I'm Bud Ryan. I'm with  
25 Pax Christi, New Mexico. I would like to know is

25

1 there anyone here who can tell me why you would need  
2 more pits or new nuclear weapons? Is there anyone  
3 here who can tell me the good that nuclear weapons  
4 have brought to the United States or to the world? If  
5 there is anyone here that thinks nuclear weapons have  
6 done some good in the world, I would suggest that you  
7 visit the Hiroshima Peace Museum, and when you go,  
8 take along with you President Bush, Kim Jong-Il,  
9 President Putin, Prime Minister Tony Blair, President  
10 Jacques Chirac, Premier Wen Jiabao of China, Prime  
11 Minister Monmohan Singh of India, President Pervez  
12 Musharraf of Pakistan, Prime Minister Ehud Olmert of  
13 Israel, and nuclear wannabe President Mahmoud  
14 Ahmadi nejad of Iran. These are the men who hold the  
15 world hostage to the terror of nuclear weapons.  
16 That's right. These men are terrorists. What else  
17 could you call someone who has the power to kill  
18 millions of innocent people? What else could you call  
19 someone who could inflict the most horrific suffering  
20 and slow death to millions more? What else could you  
21 call someone who could potentially wipe out the whole  
22 human family? What else other than a terrorist of the  
23 highest magnitude?

24 And when you make your trip to the Hiroshima  
25 Peace Museum, you should also bring along with you the

1 heads of Bechtel, PWX Technologies, the Washington  
2 Group International, and any of the other bigwigs from  
3 the corporations and companies who engage in  
4 developing and manufacturing nuclear weapons.

5 I would say their reasons for making nuclear  
6 weapons are more motivated by greed and profit than in  
7 protecting the United States.

8 I doubt any of these men have ever been to  
9 the Hiroshima Peace Museum, a place where they can see  
10 just what an atomic bomb can do. And we must remember  
11 that the bombs dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki that  
12 caused so much death and suffering were small compared  
13 with the so-called advances to our current nuclear  
14 stockpile.

15 Now one might say it's a good thing that the  
16 U.S. or any of the other nuclear powers have not used  
17 a nuclear weapon in anger since Nagasaki, and that  
18 would be correct, but only up to a point. What about  
19 the uranium miners around the world whose wives have  
20 had many stillbirths and whose children suffer  
21 deformities? What about the military personnel who  
22 were forced to watch nuclear tests and later died of  
23 cancer and passed on birth defects to their children  
24 and grandchildren? What about the downwinders who  
25 suffered and died? What about the rising number of

1 thyroid problems due to atmospheric testing? What  
2 about the problem of nuclear waste contaminating our  
3 water and food? What about the colossal waste of

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

4 money, seven-plus trillion dollars, when adjusted to  
5 today's dollars, that the U.S. alone has spent on  
6 nuclear weapons? What about the potential of an  
7 accident that could kill millions of our sisters and  
8 brothers? These consequences and many more can be  
9 laid at the feet of the nuclear weapons industry,  
10 along with all the so-called leaders who support these  
11 weapons of horror. These consequences must be  
12 addressed before anyone can claim that nuclear weapons  
13 have not killed anyone since Nagasaki.

14           So I say no to new pit manufacturing in Los  
15 Alamos, because I am a rational human being. I say no  
16 to the Complex 2030 plan because this money would be  
17 better spent on schools and hospitals. I say no to  
18 all nuclear weapons because I am a follower of Jesus,  
19 who said love your enemies. And you can't love your  
20 enemies and have nuclear weapons at the same time.

21           And I say yes to the U.S. living up to the  
22 NPT treaty, because I'm a patriotic American.

23           I think that one of the ways that the U.S.  
24 can try and regain some moral leadership in the world  
25 community is to be a guide in a real push to rid the

28

1 world of nuclear weapons. We must be honest and  
2 declare that Israel has nuclear weapons, a fact that  
3 many people know already.

4           We must bring all the nuclear powers along  
5 with any nuclear wannabes to the negotiating table and  
6 declare that there is nothing good about nuclear  
7 weapons, period. We must set a timetable for the  
8 complete elimination of all nuclear weapons along with

9 multiple ways to verify that all countries are  
10 complying.

11 The nuclear powers must then put the money  
12 that will no longer be needed for nuclear weapons into  
13 programs to aid the poor with adequate food, decent  
14 housing, good schools and safe jobs with a living  
15 wage, and also to make reparations to uranium miners,  
16 downwinders, and all that have been affected by the  
17 evil that is nuclear weapons.

18 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you,  
19 Mr. Ryan. Our next speaker is Greg Mello, to be  
20 followed by Linda Wiener and Mariana Matteucci.

21 MR. GREG MELLO: Thank you, Barry, and thank  
22 you all. Thanks Ed and Jan and the others who have  
23 come down here to listen to the community. We know  
24 that this is in addition to your already demanding  
25 schedule. We appreciate it very much. My name is

29

1 Greg Mello. I'm with the Los Alamos Study Group, and  
2 with respect, I won't be speaking to the scope of the  
3 Supplemental PEIS. In fact, I was sitting here  
4 thinking of an old saying, when one side is light the  
5 other side is dark. The more energy we put into the  
6 Complex 2030 process and the less we put into  
7 convincing our elected representatives this year that  
8 we don't want pit production and we don't want new  
9 buildings for pit production, the more likely it is  
10 that nuclear warhead production will begin and grow.  
11 Let me repeat that. The more energy we put into the  
12 Complex 2030 process, the more likely we are to lose.

13 Now, I have spoken to you over many years

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

14 about nuclear weapons. Many of you I know for a long  
15 time. Tonight we're going to hear a lot of really  
16 good analysis, outstanding work by a lot of people,  
17 fantastic common sense, as we always do whenever there  
18 are meetings like this. It's always awe inspiring,  
19 really humbling to hear what ordinary people who take  
20 time from their lives to learn something about this  
21 issue and speak, just how much wisdom can come out  
22 and, of course, what a narrow soda straw it has to go  
23 through. But we have to think carefully about how we  
24 will win this struggle. What we say here this evening  
25 is not going to go very far beyond this group. Many

30

1 of us have been to dozens, many dozens or even  
2 hundreds of public meetings just like this. We have  
3 to think very carefully about how we can stop  
4 plutonium pit production from starting at Los Alamos  
5 National Laboratory, very carefully.

6 Now, Santa Fe alone could effectively say no  
7 to pit production, but we actually have to do it. But  
8 we need a very specific outcome.

9 Now, we know about the NPT, we know about  
10 the need for nuclear disarmament. Many of us are  
11 extremely popular in the poles. 84 percent favor full  
12 nuclear disarmament pursuant to the NPT, but we need  
13 to stop funding for the \$1,000,000,000 plutonium pit  
14 factory which is now being just at the very beginning  
15 of design and construction at Los Alamos National  
16 Laboratory.

17 Now, the House of Representatives  
18 Appropriations Committee wants to stop this project.

19 The only person in the Senate that's really pushing it  
20 is Senator Domenici. It's hanging in the balance.

21 FROM THE FLOOR: What can we do?

22 MR. GREG MELLO: We need to talk to our --  
23 talk to Mr. Udall. We need to work within our  
24 organizations. Democracy works best when we are not  
25 atomized as isolated individuals, but we work with our

31

1 own organizations. And the nuclear organizations who  
2 are here will help you with your church, with your  
3 business. And then we need to talk to our -- talk to  
4 Congressman Udall. He is very accessible, generally  
5 very accessible. Talk to Senator Bingaman. This will  
6 ruin the Lab. They are hearing from people within the  
7 Laboratory who know that pit production will destroy  
8 production as a scientific laboratory. So they are  
9 hearing from them already.

10 I was just in Washington. That's what I  
11 heard there. Now, everybody in Washington knows that  
12 the Labs are a welfare deal. So we don't have to make  
13 that point. That's common knowledge. So I guess one  
14 of the points that I would like to make is that we are  
15 winning, that the nuclear weapons complex has lost the  
16 social consensus that allows it to design and build  
17 weapons of mass destruction. Maybe it's collateral  
18 damage from all this talk about WMD, but it's not  
19 popular. It's not popular even in Los Alamos National  
20 Laboratory. It's not popular.

21 I mean, how many of you have lived here for  
22 a long time, talked to people from the Lab and they  
23 say, I don't work on nuclear weapons. Well, the fact

24 is that 75 or 80 percent of every dollar at Los Alamos  
25 National Laboratory is nuclear weapons.

32

1 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: May I ask you to  
2 summarize your comments?

3 MR. GREG MELLO: Thank you. So I guess we  
4 should not take our eyes from the ball. We have to be  
5 very clear. And with the kind of strong, value-based  
6 statements that we just heard we can build bridges  
7 with other organizations. But don't wait for  
8 anything. Go ahead, press forward, get others to  
9 follow you. Be a leader yourself. Others -- and if  
10 you need help, call. Say, I'm going to do this, help  
11 me, and people will come out and help. That's -- at  
12 least that's it. Thank you very much.

13 MR. TED WYKA: Thank you.

14 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you,  
15 Mr. Mello. Next speaker is Linda Wiener. She will be  
16 followed by Mariana Matteucci and John Witham and Jay  
17 Coghlan.

18 MS. LINDA WIENER: Thank you. My name is  
19 Linda Wiener. I work with Concerned Citizens for  
20 Nuclear Safety. We are mainly concerned with the  
21 health of the environment and the health of people,  
22 and both economically and physically, who live near  
23 Los Alamos and the other nuclear facilities.

24 Now, others have really eloquently expressed  
25 tonight already why we shouldn't do this at all. So I

33

1 am going to talk specifically about Los Alamos, and  
2 why it is not an appropriate site.

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

3           On this little handout we got in the how --  
4 "how we got here" box, they talk about closing Rocky  
5 Flats. They didn't talk about why. It was closed  
6 because of massive radioactive contamination of the  
7 environment. And that's what pit production does.  
8 And will do. Los Alamos already has a lot of  
9 problems. Even obeying any kind of environmental laws  
10 we have now. Recently two huge fines have been levied  
11 against them for their failure to comply with health  
12 and safety regulations. And their monitoring is way  
13 below par. They are simply not able to protect our  
14 environment, even at the level that they are working  
15 at now. This is not going to get any better now that  
16 that Bechtel is in charge.

17           Next week there is going to be an article  
18 published in La Jicari ta which shows clearly that  
19 Bechtel has an abysmal environmental record  
20 worldwide. They are not going to care very much about  
21 protecting the environment and the health of the  
22 people around here.

23           And then if you couple this with the ongoing  
24 security problems at Los Alamos, you see that it's a  
25 record for -- it's just heading towards another

34

1 disaster. Los Alamos, especially the Los Alamos with  
2 Bechtel in charge, could not possibly be a safe or  
3 secure site for anybody living in this area. So  
4 that's all I want to say about this.

5           But, please, write to your Congress people  
6 and put pressure on all your public officials. Thank  
7 you.

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

8 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you.

9 Okay. Our next speaker is Mariana

10 Matteucci, followed by John Witham and Jay Coghlan.

11 MS. VICTORIA WIENER: Actually, my name is

12 Victoria Wiener and I'm speaking instead of Mariana.

13 I was born in New Mexico. I was born right here in

14 Santa Fe. I am now 17 years old, and I really hope to

15 grow old in New Mexico. But my one little hesitation

16 is the shame I feel in having something like Los

17 Alamos -- that direction. I think it is shameful that

18 we are trying to find more effective ways of killing,

19 massive killing. Terrible. I don't know what else

20 you call it. When we should be trying to find ways to

21 cure cancer, cure AIDS, cure many of the diseases that

22 nuclear waste makes. And it's not their job to kill.

23 Scientists are not meant to kill. Scientists are

24 meant to save. And I just -- that's my only

25 hesitation for living in a place like New Mexico. I

35

1 want to live in a New Mexico that's not trying to kill

2 people but that's trying to save lives. And that's

3 all I care about. So that's all I need to say.

4 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: All right. The

5 next gentlemen have asked to go together. They have a

6 Power Point presentation.

7 Our next speakers will be John Witham and

8 Jay Coghlan, and they have asked to go together as

9 they have a Power Point presentation, which we're

10 going to run for them as part of their presentation.

11 And when they are finished, our next speaker will be

12 Travis Gibson, and he would be followed by Richard

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

13 Khanlian.

14 MR. JOHN WITHAM: We're not ready yet.

15 MR. JAY COGLAN: First of all I'm Jay

16 Coghlan with Nuclear Watch New Mexico.

17 MR. JOHN WITHAM: John Witham, also with

18 Nuclear Watch.

19 MR. JAY COGLAN: How long is that going to

20 take?

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I am trying to get

22 this thing up.

23 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Is Travis Gibson

24 handy? Travis, would you like to speak? And then

25 Richard Khanlian will be on deck.

36

1 MR. TRAVIS GIBSON: Hi. My name is Travis  
2 Gibson. I'm a senior at Desert Academy. And I'm  
3 reading a letter on behalf of my mom, who couldn't be  
4 here tonight, Sasha Pyle.

5 Anyone familiar with the Russian Revolution  
6 of 1917, and the overthrow of the tsars, has heard of  
7 Rasputin, the charismatic or possibly mad mystic who  
8 served as a close confidant of the last tsarina.

9 Rasputin's enemies were astonished, when they tried to  
10 kill him, at how tough and resilient he proved to be.  
11 This man survived being beaten, poisoned, stabbed,  
12 shot, whipped with chains and thrown into the frozen  
13 river.

14 If Rasputin had been a DOE project, he would  
15 have come back with a new name and a little cosmetic  
16 surgery each time. Deterrent Rasputin would have come  
17 back as Advanced Concept Rasputin, mini-Rasputin,

18 Bunker-Rasputin, Rasputin Stewardship, Modern Pit  
19 Rasputin, Reliable Replacement Rasputin, and then  
20 Complex 1917 Rasputin.

21           Each time that DOE comes out with an  
22 elaborate new plan for the nation's nuclear weapons  
23 complex, it's actually the same tough and resilient  
24 old thing in disguise -- your eagerness to gobble up  
25 our tax dollars on designing and making new kinds of

37

1 nukes, in direct contravention of our international  
2 treaty obligations, and as if our huge arsenal of  
3 existing weapons is now suddenly worthless, after the  
4 six trillion dollars we taxpayers have already  
5 invested in it since World War II.

6           Complex 2030 is code for new designs and  
7 ramped-up plutonium pit manufacturing. The flimsy  
8 excuse for these initiatives is your ostensible  
9 concerns about reliability of weapons within the  
10 existing stockpile, due to questions about the effect  
11 of aging of plutonium pits.

12           Well, now we have new and better scientific  
13 data on pit lifetimes. The NNSA's pit aging study and  
14 its subsequent independent review by the JASONS, a  
15 consortium of eminent career nuclear engineers, has  
16 laid this concern to rest. What are the new findings  
17 and why are they so revolutionary. Pits can last up  
18 to or possibly more than a century with virtually no  
19 danger of breakdown. So it turns out that our  
20 existing stockpile will be reliable for decades to  
21 come, presumably long enough that we would never need  
22 to manufacture another nuclear weapon, even if we were

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

23 unconscionably slow about implementing steps to comply  
24 with nonproliferation treaty which we signed over 35  
25 years ago.

38

1           MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: If you would slow  
2 down a little bit, I will give you more time.

3           MR. TRAVIS GIBSON: Thanks. This is my  
4 mother speaking when I read this.

5           I became first active in nuclear weapons  
6 issues almost 20 years ago. I was drawn to the  
7 subject by the controversy over WIPP, the world's  
8 first deep underground for plutonium-contaminated and  
9 toxic chemical wastes resulting from bomb-making  
10 throughout the national DOE complex. WIPP was built  
11 and opened in southeastern corner of the state despite  
12 vocal opposition from many quadrants.

13           During my time studying WIPP, I familiarized  
14 myself with the marvelous book called "Deadly Defense"  
15 by the group Radioactive Waste Campaign in New York.  
16 This book, compiled solely from internal DOE documents  
17 acquired through the Freedom of Information Act,  
18 mapped out the environmental catastrophe at each and  
19 every nuclear weapons R and D facility around the  
20 country. A weapon which we, until recently, have  
21 vowed we hope to never have to use thus points its  
22 toxic finger back at American citizens. The industry  
23 that fabricates these weapons is a dirty one, and it's  
24 often shielded from public view on the grounds of  
25 national security -- words which are now used as if

39

1 they were magic, as if they justified any expenditure  
2 or any course of action.

3 I bring this up now because the parallels  
4 are very real between WIPP and this new Complex 2030  
5 plan. Here are some ways in which the WIPP story is  
6 now being echoed.

7 First, a project that has very far-reaching  
8 ethical, environmental and policy ramifications not  
9 just here but nationally and even globally is promoted  
10 to us as economic development, as a local issue.  
11 Never mind that the numbers don't really add up  
12 either, because DOE's projected spending figures  
13 completely fail to address the enormous future costs  
14 of cleanup and environmental remediation, to the  
15 extent that it will even be possible. Cost overruns  
16 and environmental cleanup left undone are the  
17 hallmarks of any facility where DOE sets up shop.

18 Second, the only people in favor of the big  
19 fat spending project are those who stand to gain from  
20 it financially themselves, or those who, harkening  
21 back to more innocent and less Orwellian times, still  
22 take the government at face value about those magic  
23 words, "national security." In other words, a wide  
24 range of opposition exists among nonDOE-employed  
25 citizens who have taken the time to inform themselves

40

1 on the real consequences of our bloated budget for  
2 nuclear weapons, R and D, now at one-and-a-half times  
3 the peak of Cold War spending. It's easy to  
4 demonstrate, also, that the money that pours into Los  
5 Alamos County, our state's riches and whitest county,

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

6 stays right there. It doesn't do much for the rest of  
7 us. If you don't believe me, go to the website  
8 nukewatch.org and read the graphs and text which  
9 demonstrate this, in the four-page economic analysis  
10 fact sheet contained within volume 7, issue 4 of the  
11 Watchdog newsletter.

12 Third, WIPP creates new problems while  
13 failing to solve existing problems. Not one facility  
14 across the national complex has been cleaned up  
15 because of WIPP. 20 WIPPs couldn't begin to handle  
16 the nation's transuranic bomb waste. And if the WIPP  
17 we have was truly built in the best site possible, as  
18 we were assured, exactly where would the 20 or 40  
19 other WIPPs go? The problem for which it was sold to  
20 us as a solution remained unsolved. Yet this dump  
21 itself has frighteningly real potential to become  
22 another dot on the map of DOE boo-boos, by releasing  
23 radioactive and chemical waste into the biosphere,  
24 particularly into the groundwater. Conversely,  
25 Complex 2030 will create innumerable problems, while

41

1 the problem it was supposedly dreamed up to address is  
2 no longer in existence.

3 Fourth, WIPP may have strategically acquired  
4 the flavor of a done deal, but it's fourth resemblance  
5 to Complex 2030 serves as a cautionary tale for us  
6 this time around, because Complex 2030 is certainly  
7 not yet a done deal. In a nutshell, there is simply  
8 no valid scientific consensus or justification to  
9 proceed. The question we are again seeing raised is,  
10 can scientific reality ever hope to trump political

11 and economic momentum in DOE's decisions? What role  
12 does science actually play? In the battle between  
13 truth and pork, which one usually wins? Some of us  
14 have been paying attention to that dynamic for a while  
15 now.

16           Now that the justification for the Reliable  
17 Replacement Warhead program has been completely  
18 knocked out at the knees, why are we still reading in  
19 the newspapers that there is a contest underway  
20 between the national labs at Los Alamos and Livermore,  
21 California, to see who gets this big prize, a chance  
22 to emulate Rocky-Flats levels of systematic pollution  
23 and accidental release?

24           The scoping documents that relate to this  
25 proposed Complex 2030 display a purported willingness

42

1 to examine alternative courses of action, but the  
2 alternatives presented are phony alternatives. It's  
3 like a restaurant that only has poisonous food on the  
4 menu. We are saying, go back to the kitchen and start  
5 over. We don't want these phony alternatives because  
6 they are lousy choices for New Mexico's environment,  
7 for its diversified economic future, for the nation's  
8 policy and for this planet we live on, which requires  
9 attention to more than arsenals. Other nations are  
10 being drawn into an accelerating nuclear arms race by  
11 our actions directly. Global stability suffers,  
12 economies suffer, people suffer, air, water and earth  
13 suffer.

14           DOE has begun to recognize that its  
15 Environmental Impact Statements for all of its

16 proposals need to address the potential consequences  
17 of terrorist acts.

18 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Mr. Gibson, are you  
19 close to the end?

20 MR. TRAVIS GIBSON: Yes.

21 DOE has begun to recognize that its  
22 environmental impact statements for all of its  
23 proposals need to address the potential consequences  
24 of terrorist acts. We are being told that the new  
25 nuclear designs are a response to terrorism, a part of

43

1 our so-called war on terror, but the truth is that  
2 they are a catalyst for terrorism. Never mind that  
3 the entire concept of usable nukes for the battlefield  
4 constitutes a perfect example of terrorism. The other  
5 fact of contemporary geopolitics to which DOE seems  
6 determined to remain blind is this -- if recognized  
7 nations won't attack us in conventional ways because  
8 almost all of our resources have gone into nukes and  
9 very little into diplomacy or beneficial technologies,  
10 terrorist groups will then become the world's  
11 messenger of choice for the United States. The  
12 installations themselves become targets, and the  
13 tax-paying citizens are seen as the bearers of blame  
14 for the destructive policies they fund. What impact  
15 might this have on those of us who live here? The  
16 Cerro Grande fire will look like a walk in the park  
17 compared to a terrorist attack on a newly consolidated  
18 weapon complex and full-scale pit factory.

19 The truth is, Complex 2030 itself is  
20 terrorism. It wouldn't make us safer. It would

21 make us less safe. It would be a tragic waste of  
22 resources reflecting a tragic failure of creativity  
23 and vision.

24 Thank you.

25 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Mr. Gibson, thank

44

1 you very much. I appreciate that.

2 Are we ready here? Do we want to have  
3 another speaker? Is Richard Khanlian here? Kalliroi  
4 Matsakis? You'll be next.

5 MR. RICHARD KHANLIAN: All right. My name  
6 is Richard Khanlian. As a 21-year resident of Santa  
7 Fe, I'm opposed to the goals of this project 2030 and  
8 the expansion of nuclear pit production at Los Alamos,  
9 both for local and for global reasons. For local  
10 reasons, because of what it will do to the character  
11 of the lab at Los Alamos, and for global reasons  
12 because of what it will do to the world environment  
13 that we all share.

14 Los Alamos was chosen as the site for the  
15 Manhattan Project in the 1940s mainly because of its  
16 secrecy. It was essentially a blank spot on the map,  
17 and access could be controlled. Its suitability for  
18 the handling and disposal of nuclear waste was not a  
19 primary consideration at the time. It should be now.  
20 It's very unsuitable for large-scale production of  
21 nuclear pits.

22 Los Alamos aquifers all lead to the Rio  
23 Grande aquifer, which is a source of drinking water  
24 for more than a million people, as well as water for  
25 agricultural uses. We have already found that

1 dangerous substances have been found in the test  
2 wells, for example, hexavalent chromium and  
3 perchlorates. Over time these will tend to migrate to  
4 the river. There's already lots of waste in temporary  
5 storage at Los Alamos. We should not be adding to it  
6 as long as no permanent disposal solution exists.

7           And as we learned in 2000, there is also the  
8 risk of wildfire and the dissemination of waste  
9 products by smoke that blows over this whole area.

10           You may assure us that in the project 2030  
11 that adequate safety precautions will be taken, but  
12 the DOE has a credibility problem, as has been  
13 measured by the speakers here. The previous pit  
14 production at the facility at Rocky Flats is now a  
15 Superfund site. What kind of assurances were made to  
16 its neighbors during its operation?

17           A Hanford, Washington, waste has leaked into  
18 the Columbia River, and there has been waste leaks,  
19 serious waste leaks in Fernald, Ohio, which caused it  
20 to be shutdown.

21           On the Navajo reservation many cancer deaths  
22 can be traced to the supposedly safe at the time  
23 mining and milling of uranium. What about the  
24 assurances given to the downwinders during the  
25 atmospheric nuclear tests in Nevada and Utah? We know

1 how that turned out.

2           All of us here in Santa Fe and the  
3 surrounding communities are downwinders when it comes  
4 to Los Alamos.

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

5           Now, for national and global  
6 considerations. At a time when we're telling other  
7 nations not to pursue nuclear weapons, what kind of  
8 message does it send that we would work on a new  
9 generation of nukes here in the U.S.? Do as we say,  
10 not as we do.

11           When we debate the development of tactical  
12 nuclear weapon and bunker busters, as done in this  
13 administration in Congress, and has not forsworn first  
14 strike use, is it surprising that North Korea and Iran  
15 might feel they also need nukes in order to get  
16 respect? We think of ourselves as the good guys, but  
17 others may not see us that way. But remember, we are  
18 the only nation to have used nuclear weapons in  
19 wartime against civilian targets.

20           An article in the current bulletin of the  
21 Atomic Scientist shows that the U.S. has about 10,000  
22 identified nuclear warheads. At the same time studies  
23 at Los Alamos and Livermore indicate that plutonium  
24 pit life is 85 to 100 years or more, so existing  
25 weapons should be reliable for decades to come.

47

1 What's the urgency to gear up for more pit production?

2           The nuclear weapons industry, like the rest  
3 of military industrial complex, tends to become its  
4 own reason for being. Now, with the involvement of  
5 Bechtel, Los Alamos is not only a jobs program but a  
6 potential profit center as well. As we have seen like  
7 Bechtel did in Iraq, when things didn't go so well for  
8 them there they pulled out and left a mess for others  
9 to clean up.

10           There is a security threat that if unchecked  
11 will probably leave our children and grandchildren and  
12 their children inhabiting a post-apocalyptic wasteland  
13 without the detonation of a single weapon. That's  
14 global warming. Scientific consensus is overwhelming  
15 and the timetable is urgent. That's where our best  
16 and bright test minds should be focused, and that  
17 could be the future of LANL. Thank you.

18           MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you very  
19 much. I have already announced Kalliroi Matsakis to  
20 go ahead. I'm going to take her and then we'll take  
21 you gentlemen, and then we'll have our first break.  
22 Ms. Matsakis?

23           MS. KALLIROI MATSAKIS: My name is Kalliroi  
24 Matsakis. I'm speaking on behalf of Concerned  
25 Citizens for Nuclear Safety and I'm going to speak

48

1 about the impact this will have on my generation, but  
2 first I would like to do a quick demonstration.

3           This must be a stand-alone document, because  
4 otherwise the public will be required to review a  
5 mountain of documents in order to make an informed  
6 comment, and we happen to have most of the documents  
7 which were referenced in the Notice of Intent in our  
8 office and decided to bring them down as a visual  
9 demonstration, so I'm going to put them up on the  
10 table for all of us to see.

11           We have to remember when we are looking at  
12 this pile that this is not all of the documents, just  
13 the majority. And that in addition, the draft  
14 document will be another three volumes. So what we

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

15 are saying is that the proposed transmission must be  
16 made in a single document with minimal reference  
17 documents. And in addition, the public must be  
18 provided with 180 days to make comments, otherwise we  
19 won't have sufficient time to review all of them and  
20 make educated comments.

21           And then I want to put this perspective in.  
22 I want to put this solely in the perspective of  
23 myself. In the year 2030 I will be 47 years old. If  
24 I have children in the next ten years they will be  
25 about my age now, probably younger. My generation and

49

1 their children will be directly impacted. This is our  
2 future, this proposal we're talking about, in the year  
3 2030. So the Department of Energy showed us their  
4 vision for the transformed complex, but I would like  
5 to take this opportunity to give you my vision for a  
6 transformed complex as an alternative.

7           My vision is of a future in which the United  
8 States dismantles all of our nuclear weapons, and  
9 cleans up the legacy of environmental contamination,  
10 which is currently unleashed in our lands and water,  
11 and return it to the levels where, I would like to  
12 say, down to such that a future subsistence farmer can  
13 live on the land, drink the water, along with their  
14 children, for their entire lives. That future can be  
15 determined.

16           My vision of the future in which science  
17 could be used to solve the problems which are facing  
18 us now, such as the contamination that we have  
19 created, and disposal of the waste that's already been

20 created and global warming.

21           The waste that is going to be generated by  
22 this proposal will remain radioactive for a million  
23 years, far beyond our life.

24           I see nothing good about this proposal. I  
25 feel the DOE and NNSA must go back to the drawing

50

1 board and bring forth a proposal that includes full  
2 cleanup of all types of contamination and total  
3 disarmament beginning now, and completed by the year  
4 2030, if not before.

5           MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you.

6           MR. JAY COGHLAN: We're ready.

7           MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Okay. At long  
8 last, John Witham and Jay Coghlan.

9           MR. JOHN WITHAM: Thank you. I'm John  
10 Witham of Nuclear Watch New Mexico. It's good to see  
11 all you here tonight. I'm here because I believe the  
12 NNSA should consider other fundamentally different  
13 options in the Supplemental EIS, and I believe that  
14 the rationale for the proposed alternative is flawed  
15 and unjustified.

16           As an example, previously the NNSA claimed  
17 that plutonium pits will waste themselves and we know  
18 that plutonium pits have a limited lifetime. Without  
19 replacing the bombs we could wait and find half of our  
20 stockpile gone to waste. This was NNSA spokesperson  
21 Lyle Welch in 2002. Yet, and in contrast, a recent  
22 independent study by the JASON found that most primary  
23 types have credible minimal lifetimes in excess of 100  
24 years as regards to the aging of the plutonium. Those

25 with assessed minimum lifetimes of 100 years or less

51

1 have clear mitigation paths that are proposed and/or  
2 being implemented. Nothing has really changed. This  
3 was found long ago in the 1993 stockpile life study  
4 done at Sandia. We found the statement that "although  
5 nuclear weapons age they do not wear out. They last  
6 as long as the nuclear weapons community, the DoD and  
7 the DOE desires. In fact, we can find no example of  
8 nuclear weapons we found where the age was ever a  
9 major factor in the retirement decision."

10 We did a little analysis and we found that  
11 the oldest weapons in the planned U.S. stockpile was  
12 28 years old, so that leaves at least 70 years for a  
13 democratic discussion of rational nuclear weapons  
14 policies, and to practice a thinning of the stockpile,  
15 reducing the arsenal as per international treaties.

16 As will be seen in this table, the average  
17 age is actually only a little over 20 years. These  
18 calculations, by the way, are -- were derived from the  
19 1995 Tri-Lab Stockpile Surveillance Past and Future,  
20 and as part of the fact sheet that we have as the next  
21 slide.

22 Yet the NNSA is reaching for other  
23 arguments. In one statement that was made by the Matt  
24 Letourneau, spokesperson for Senator Domenici, "We  
25 find regardless of the quality or safety of the

52

1 plutonium, there will still be various other parts of  
2 the weapons program that will age and need to be dealt

3 with. "

4           And Mr. Wyka earlier this week made a  
5 statement that "neither plutonium lifetime nor pit  
6 lifetime equal weapon lifetime. A nuclear weapon  
7 relies on thousands of parts and components, and we  
8 must have a responsive infrastructure to support the  
9 stockpile because we know that the stockpile repairs  
10 and replacements will be required.

11           And yet as, experts in DOE's own documents  
12 show, these arguments were debunked years ago, and the  
13 Science-Based Stockpile Stewardship released in the  
14 year 2000, Raymond Jeanoz states, "The high explosive  
15 use in the United States weapons has been found to  
16 improve systematically with age in key measures of  
17 performance. "

18           And then even earlier, in 1996, the  
19 Stockpile Stewardship Management PEIS, which is the  
20 basis for this Complex 2030 supplemental, states that  
21 "Thus, over time, due to manufacturing data and  
22 subsequent lab tests, high confidence in the safety  
23 and reliability of nonnuclear components and  
24 subsystems can be established." If these are -- the  
25 DOE chooses to neglect simple steps to ensure

53

1 stockpile safety and reliability, if these are the  
2 real responsibilities for the complex, which it's  
3 failing to do.

4           In follow-up audit on stockpile surveillance  
5 testing, the DOE inspector general in October of this  
6 year stated, "As a result of continuing backlog of  
7 surveillance tests, the Department lacks vital

8 information about the reliability of the stockpile."

9           And I want to conclude my comments by saying  
10 that I think that we're being faced with limited  
11 choices between varying degrees of expanded bomb  
12 production and new designs. The Complex 2030 has  
13 three stated scenarios, and both of -- all of the --  
14 the no action and reduced operations alternatives  
15 still call for at least up to eight pits per year to  
16 be produced. And I believe that an enhanced global  
17 security alternative must be considered, whose  
18 existence is custodianship of the existing stockpile  
19 of nuclear weapons while they await dismantlements.  
20 And this alternative should strengthen our own  
21 national security by encouraging all countries towards  
22 nuclear disarmament as mandated by the 1970  
23 nonproliferation treaty, and an important part of this  
24 custodianship should be cleanup of the contamination  
25 from the Cold War production of these weapons.

54

1           Thank you.

2           MR. JAY COGHLAN: Barry, how much time do I  
3 have left?

4           MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Five minutes.

5           MR. JAY COGHLAN: Okay. Very good. So to  
6 summarize what John was saying, first of all, we found  
7 out that the pits or the primaries last a good  
8 century.

9           And earlier, it's been stated by one of  
10 these scientists who belong to the JASONS that  
11 reviewed that pit lifetime study, that high explosives  
12 actually are the types that's used, high explosives

13 grow more stable, and it's clear that nonnuclear  
14 components could be rigorously tested both in whole  
15 weapons unarmed but still whole, in flight tests, and  
16 then they could be also tested outside the weapons  
17 themselves.

18           So this begs the question of what is Complex  
19 2030 really about. The answer to that is it's about  
20 2001 Nuclear Posture Review, which is, in our opinion,  
21 was an extremely regressive step in the course of  
22 global nuclear weapons policies. Specifically, it  
23 called for design reduction of earth penetrators and  
24 so-called bunker busters and lower yield, more  
25 accurate nuclear weapons, that is to say, the

55

1 so-called mini nukes. And to make this real right  
2 now, be aware that, first of all, this country, of  
3 course, has irrigated onto itself the right to create  
4 the attacks as deemed necessary and is very much -- or  
5 Bush has refused to rule out the possible nuclear  
6 strike against Iran. And further, it looks like we --  
7 a test called Divine Strake is back on its way to the  
8 Nevada Test Site, that the Department of Defense will  
9 be reaching a decision in January. I think it's  
10 pretty clear if you look at it, that that test is  
11 about fine tuning the codes for the use of the  
12 existing earth penetrator that the U.S. currently  
13 possess, the B61-11.

14           The head of NNSA, Linton Brooks, pretty much  
15 sums up what I believe the true intent of Complex  
16 2030, that is to incorporate those new designs under  
17 the reliability replacement warhead, but that new

18 warhead is a means or the modus operandi by which the  
19 Complex seeks to rejuvenate, revitalize itself,  
20 perpetuate its own existence.

21 If we could move, please?

22 Now it's been repeatedly stated that the  
23 NNSA does not attempt to influence policy. That, of  
24 course, only is half true. In fact, the current head  
25 of NNSA was part of a neoconservative think tank that

56

1 in January of -- this paper that essentially 10, 11  
2 months later became the backbone of Bush's Nuclear  
3 Posture Review, and we're still seeing implementation  
4 of that policy as we speak.

5 What the -- what this process does is offer  
6 false choices between varying degrees of bomb  
7 production. The preferred alternative wants to kick  
8 up pit production to at least 125 pits per year. The  
9 so-called no-action alternative and the so-called  
10 reduced operations alternative incorporates present  
11 plans to expand pit production at Los Alamos by 8 pits  
12 a year. And as John has already said, it's our  
13 opinion, the strong opinion of others, that a  
14 different type of alternative truly needs to be  
15 considered. We call it an enhanced global security  
16 alternative.

17 Now, Ted referred or made an argument that  
18 there were continued -- there would be a continuing  
19 need for a responsive infrastructure to address the  
20 accumulation of small changes that would be made over  
21 the course of time through life extension programs.  
22 The right course to follow is exact replication of

23 weapons components on a strictly as needed basis.

24 This was outlined long ago by the JASONS.

25 Finally, what does this mean to Los Alamos?

57

1 It's our belief that Los Alamos is going to end up  
2 being a permanent pit production center for a number  
3 of reasons. One reason I wouldn't want you to  
4 overlook is sheer Department of Energy incompetence.  
5 They have an 80 percent failure rate in major  
6 projects, either in terms of cost overruns,  
7 scheduling, et cetera. Now I believe they badly want  
8 the Reliable Replacement Warhead effort, but  
9 nevertheless, don't overlook the Department's own  
10 inertia and failures. This can lead to LANL becoming  
11 in a de facto sense the pit production center or by  
12 default. But also these pit lifetime studies, I  
13 believe, are going to severely undercut the need for  
14 125 pits a year, and as eloquently stated, LANL is  
15 planning to up production to 80. So this will be what  
16 will occur at Los Alamos, I believe.

17 Now, to address a second possible New Mexico  
18 site, we heard three arguments tonight to have  
19 Carlsbad be considered as a future site for the  
20 consolidated pit construction center. I, of course,  
21 would like to stop that in its tracks. I would point  
22 out that one of the declared purposes of this process  
23 is to consolidate security category 1 and 2 materials  
24 at an existing security category 1 and 2 site. So I  
25 believe that would rule that out. And I would like to

58

1 see NNSA address that in the draft that, if they

2 would, please.

3 Can I go on? I got one minute.

4 Others have pointed to the need to engage in  
5 politics. There is already wonderful political  
6 fallout as a result of the pit lifetime studies. Here  
7 you have Tom Udall questioning the need for RRW,  
8 questioning whether we are meeting our needs under the  
9 NPT. He even mentioned it's possible we don't need  
10 the proposed pit production level.

11 More politics. You see the Bingaman  
12 statement, and now he is calling for a Senate hearing  
13 on the need for RRW. But we need to be very careful  
14 that other politicians don't seize upon RRW as a  
15 self-justifying end onto itself. And do note that  
16 this particular one, is a Democrat, so I'm being  
17 bipartisan in that sense.

18 Other slide, please.

19 We can win. This is what I want to  
20 encourage this audience about. We have recently  
21 defeated the modern pit facility. We have defeated  
22 the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator. We played a role  
23 in these pit lifetime studies. Nuclear Watch went to  
24 Bingaman and asked him to sponsor the legislation that  
25 required an independent review of pit lifetimes, and

59

1 this is going to have ongoing ramifications, I  
2 believe.

3 And finally, the election itself, the recent  
4 election itself creates widespread opportunity for  
5 effecting yet more change.

6 Last slide, please.

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

7 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: This is it?

8 MR. JAY COGHLAN: This is it.

9 So, lesson learned. Let's keep up the  
10 momentum. Let's engage more in politics. It is  
11 important that we engage in this particular process.  
12 It's a good democratic process and I urge everybody to  
13 do it, but it's not enough. We have to have deep  
14 political change to bring to a very near immediate  
15 halt to the extreme nuclear weapons policies of the  
16 Bush administration. Thank you.

17 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Okay. Thank you  
18 both. Before you get up and move too far, I know I  
19 said we were having a recess and we will. And so I'm  
20 going to keep it as short as possible, and Mabel Chin  
21 is going to -- hopefully five minutes then we'll start  
22 up again. So don't roll off too far. I know when we  
23 take a break there's an occasion for some people to  
24 leave. If you are leaving, I just want to thank you  
25 for coming and making your presentation if you already

60

1 have. I do encourage you to stay, but if you have to  
2 leave we really appreciate your time. We'll take a  
3 five-minute break. By the way, the next people  
4 speaking will be J. Michael Combs, Marion Wasserman  
5 and Clarissa Duran.

6 (A recess was taken.)

7 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Just a couple of  
8 points. I, first of all, I want to congratulate  
9 everyone. So far we have stayed very close to the  
10 five minute limit, and I greatly appreciate it, and I  
11 am sure you do as well.

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

12           The second is that -- excuse me. If you  
13 have to converse could I ask you to leave the room?  
14 Excuse me, if you have to converse could I ask you to  
15 leave the room?  
16           Okay. We have to have respect for all of us  
17 being here because we have to make sure that  
18 everybody, including the court reporter, can hear the  
19 presentation. Unfortunately in this room the  
20 acoustics is not ideal, and she is dealing with  
21 sometimes soft voices, sometimes fast voices, and  
22 sometimes this register up above us which is  
23 particularly bothersome to us up front. So, I'm going  
24 to ask people who are speaking to annunciate as best  
25 as you can, to speak slowly and articulate.

61

1 Otherwise, we are doing really well.

2           Our next speaker will be Michael Combs and  
3 will be followed by Marion Wasserman and Clarissa  
4 Duran.

5           MR. J. MICHAEL COMBS: Hello, family. My  
6 name is Michael Combs. I live over here on Agua  
7 Fria. And I was a teenager when I came here 35 years  
8 ago, and now this is my first year as an owl manik. I  
9 was taught that when you finish your core cycle of 13  
10 you get to the owl cycle. Each cycle brings its  
11 responsibilities as a sign. Looking down the road is  
12 one of the things, putting my shoulder to the wheel.

13           I have got some granddaughters, and I see  
14 that we have some real grave problems that I feel like  
15 threatening our national security, and we have got  
16 some real smart people up here on the hill. A lot of

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

17 scientists, a lot of knowledge, a lot of degrees, a  
18 lot of brain power, a lot of money that could be used  
19 to address those problems that my granddaughter, when  
20 she is my age and a grandmother, is going to be faced  
21 with. And we're not addressing them. And we're  
22 creating some real bad problems.

23           And I was told that not having nuclear pits  
24 was not an option. I should address -- I should save  
25 my breath to cool my soup. But what I'm hearing is

62

1 that peace is not an option. Sanity is not an  
2 option. Building a loving society is not an option.

3           One of these handouts said that we were to  
4 identify, understand, fix problems, you know, and  
5 identify reasonable alternatives. I'm thinking about  
6 the eagle's-eye view, looking at the history. When  
7 they designed this thing in the spirit of democracy,  
8 it was a big military thing. There was an empire that  
9 was going to kill us. They were watching France,  
10 England and Russia tear themselves apart. So they  
11 told the citizens early, when need be, as a reluctant  
12 last measure, we would embrace arms conflict. As soon  
13 it was over we heat up swords into plows. And we  
14 never had an armaments industry until after World War  
15 II. Every war up until then, at the end of war we  
16 scaled those tank factories back to making tractors.

17           But now we have this huge industry that  
18 makes a lot of money and they are throwing a bunch of  
19 baloney at us about we must have this stuff, and it's,  
20 like, hypnotize and mesmerize, the problems, you know,  
21 that are really threatening our national security, and

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

22 it's getting too hot. And nuclear bombs aren't going  
23 to solve that problem. Problems like -- and I look at  
24 what has the military done for New Mexico? You have  
25 got a lot of sickness on the Navajo Reservation for

63

1 the people who are mining. We have got all these --  
2 it's like a national sacrifice for the industrial  
3 murder machine which is what the armed forces are, is  
4 the only thing they are good at. They don't train  
5 them how to build dams or to restore soil.

6 And what have we got down here at the White  
7 Sands, we have got Holloman Air Force Base, we have  
8 got Cannon Air Force Base. Socorro's water supplies  
9 are too polluted because they developed depleted  
10 uranium weapons. The firing range is two miles away  
11 from Socorro downtown. And up here at Los Alamos, the  
12 labs, up at Farmington, out at Clovis, all these  
13 strangers cycling through, young people have signed  
14 up, and what good is it doing our state to be in the  
15 business of the massive industrial murder? We look at  
16 the richest county in America, right here, and right  
17 next to it is a devastated community, every index of  
18 human misery, the Espanola Valley is off the charts.  
19 And when we look at these military bases and find the  
20 domestic violence rates among the soldiers' families,  
21 you know.

22 9-11 was a boomerang and it came back and  
23 whacked us. You know, we need to be educated about  
24 that.

25 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: One minute.

1 MR. J. MICHAEL COMBS: Okay. We can't grow  
2 our food sustainably anymore. New Mexico used to be  
3 able to do that. A short period back within a living  
4 lifetime the food that we ate came from here. All of  
5 life depends on the soil. We're losing our soil.  
6 These guys up on the hill, you know, could really --  
7 if they were to address some real problems.

8 So, I guess I just want to say, we need to  
9 get Pete Domenici to help. We have got to be new  
10 warriors, a different kind of warrior. We've got to  
11 be warriors of hope, warriors of laughter, warriors of  
12 love, warriors of song. We've got to build something  
13 that can last. Thank you.

14 MS. MARION WASSERMAN: Hi.

15 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Before you start, I  
16 apologize, Mr. Wyka needs to step out for a minute.  
17 You can either wait for him or you can go ahead. And  
18 you will be on the record, in any case.

19 MS. MARION WASSERMAN: Okay. I can go  
20 ahead.

21 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Okay. Please.

22 MS. MARION WASSERMAN: My name is Marion  
23 Wasserman. I have lived in New Mexico for over 20  
24 years. And I am a mother of a daughter who will be  
25 47 -- no, 37 in 2030. And I really hope that her

1 reality isn't going to be still fighting against the  
2 pit production and the proliferation of nuclear  
3 bombs. I find it really, really sad when I travel the  
4 world and I think about the place that I live. It's

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

5 the place that we make these bombs. And it's not by  
6 our choice. I am sorry that I'm cynical enough to not  
7 believe that this makes any difference, standing up  
8 and saying no, but I oppose any expansion in Los  
9 Alamos on the development of pits or any other  
10 weaponry. And I don't know what else I can say beyond  
11 that.

12 I hope that the resources of our tax monies  
13 of our scientists and the knowledge that we have could  
14 be used to clean it up. I only see more degradation  
15 to our environment and not a lot of solutions. And I  
16 don't understand why it's okay for us to build new  
17 nuclear bombs and to tell other countries that this is  
18 not an okay thing to do, and Iran and North Korea and  
19 every other place, Israel, are not allowed to do  
20 this. Israel probably is allowed to do it. But here  
21 I just say no and I oppose any expansion or pit  
22 production.

23 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you, ma'am.  
24 All right. We have a little catching up to do here.  
25 Clarissa Duran. The next two speakers would be Norman

66

1 Budow and Dean Williamson. Please.

2 MS. CLARISSA DURAN: Hi. I'm Clarissa  
3 Duran, and I just want to say hi because I see all of  
4 my friends and all of the people that feel the same  
5 way that I do about this, and there are lots of people  
6 who I really appreciate for giving us the great  
7 education and, to me, I wish it could be on a  
8 different topic. And I wish we didn't have to discuss  
9 this because there weren't any nuclear weapons. But I

10 want to -- I'm from here. I'm from Espanola, and I  
11 want to talk about what it really means to live in the  
12 backyard of Los Alamos. And I first want to just  
13 honor who I am and how I got here. And that is to say  
14 that I am the daughter of two parents from some of the  
15 oldest Spanish families in this state, and the  
16 great-great-granddaughter of women who are from San  
17 Juan and Picuris Pueblos, and as a person who is of  
18 mixed background, Spanish and indigenous people, I  
19 feel like I have to bear witness to the degradation of  
20 those societies by the Los Alamos National Laboratory.

21 I want to say that Northern New Mexico was a  
22 beautiful place to live before Los Alamos National  
23 Laboratories, that there were fields and that  
24 communities worked together on temporal crops to bring  
25 food to their families and their communities, and that

67

1 communities got together on a weekly basis and really  
2 enjoyed each other, and that we don't really have that  
3 anymore. And I have two children. My son is 18 and  
4 my daughter is 16, and I hope that everything that I  
5 am, that after they go out in the world that they will  
6 want to come back here because this is my home. And I  
7 hope that it will always be our family's home because  
8 it is so beautiful and the people here are so  
9 beautiful and the spirit of land is so beautiful.

10 But what's happened is the Los Alamos  
11 National Laboratory came to Northern New Mexico. That  
12 all of a sudden, since the '30s, people in Northern  
13 New Mexico fight over limited resources. All of a  
14 sudden we want what you people in this room who are

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

15 wearing suits want. We want expensive homes and cars  
16 and vacations abroad, and every imaginable gadget out  
17 there on the market. And that wasn't my people, and I  
18 don't want that to be my people. I don't want that to  
19 be the definition of our -- I don't want us to  
20 continue to be janitors and secretaries and low-level  
21 managers at the Lab so that we can buy those things,  
22 so that we're too worn out to come to a meeting like  
23 this because maybe we work at the Labs and we have to  
24 work at another job to make sure that we get all those  
25 things and become what the American society stands

68

1 for.

2           And I just want to say that Northern New  
3 Mexico people and the indigenous people in this state  
4 know what the Iraqi people feel. We know what it is  
5 to be invaded and to lose our lands and to have  
6 constant promises made to us and have those broken.  
7 And I never considered myself an American. I  
8 considered myself a Northern New Mexican and a citizen  
9 of this world, and I just want to remind Los Alamos  
10 National Laboratory that you are on borrowed land. It  
11 was never given to you. And one of these days someone  
12 is going to ask for it back. And even before then, I  
13 hope that my children, who understand so much more  
14 than I do at their age, will come to know the true  
15 beauty that has sustained our people for thousands and  
16 thousands of years in this area. And all I want to  
17 tell you is, please, stop using our resources.  
18 Please, stop using our energy to create death and  
19 destruction. Please use our resources to support

20 human life.

21 MR. TED WYKA: Thank you.

22 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you,

23 Ms. Duran. Norman Budow and Dean Williamson and

24 Oshana Spring.

25 MR. NORMAN BUDOW: Folks, I think that we

69

1 all give this a lot of passion and a lot of feeling  
2 about the purpose of this meeting. I would like to  
3 talk a little bit about how I found about it.

4 I was in the military during the second  
5 World War, and those soldiers died at the rate of 800  
6 a day I was told. You know, not very many left. I  
7 came here, I loved this state, but I was troubled by  
8 certain things. We have a situation here where we  
9 have signed a nonproliferation treaty, we see, that we  
10 are trying to deter other nations from developing  
11 their own nuclear capacity. We come with very poor  
12 grace for us to continue, and one of the questions  
13 comes to mind is, how much is enough.

14 A few years ago, Admiral Stansfield Turner,  
15 speaking to the Council on International Relations,  
16 said, we have 6,000 nuclear bombs. I would like to  
17 see it go down to 2,500. And I encountered him one on  
18 one after this lecture. I said why -- why 2,500? How  
19 much is enough? And he answered, that's a start. I  
20 suppose that's some kind of an answer. But I am  
21 wondering, you know, we have some of the finest minds  
22 up at Los Alamos, and I am thinking, can't they  
23 direct -- redirect their intelligence, their energy,  
24 their efforts, towards life-confirming work rather

25 than making more and more bombs?

70

1 I have a friend who was in the infantry in  
2 Europe. He got out. He worked as a project  
3 engineer. He didn't want to make weapons, so he  
4 opened his own business in medical technology, and his  
5 feeling was clear. I don't have to do this thing.  
6 There are so many unmet needs.

7 I'm a volunteer at the State Agency on Aging  
8 and Disability, and we get calls all over the state.  
9 We are 40th in health. And that means we are better  
10 than 10 other states. But, you know -- so, you know,  
11 we have a situation we have to deal with. A cure for  
12 cancer, a cure for macular degeneration, a cure for  
13 Parkinson's. These would be things that would really  
14 put a legacy of our fine scientists to work, rather  
15 than making more and more and more boom-booms. It  
16 could be done. It requires imagination and it  
17 requires resolve.

18 And as Socrates said 3,000 years ago, "An  
19 unexamined life is not worth living."

20 Einstein said, "Insanity is doing the same  
21 thing over and over and over again and expecting  
22 different results."

23 Eisenhower, if you want to read something,  
24 something that might cause you to think, look at his  
25 farewell address where he talked about the fact that

71

1 this focus on weapons robs children, robs the people  
2 of a society.

3 So I am really hoping that something

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

4 positive, a real legacy will come out of this meeting.

5 MR. TED WYKA: Thank you.

6 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you, sir.

7 Dean Williamson, to be followed by Oshana Spring and

8 Scott Koune.

9 MR. DEAN WILLIAMSON: Good evening. I'm

10 Dean Williamson speaking on behalf of the Green Party

11 of New Mexico. At our Green Party Council meeting

12 this weekend, past weekend, we discussed this hearing

13 from the 2030 and the manner of decision. Green Party

14 is not -- is against any further development of more

15 nuclear weapons. I would like to say more.

16 I'm also speaking as a Native New Mexican,

17 living in the Santa Fe area about 40 years, raised my

18 daughter, and two grandsons being raised now here, and

19 over the years coming to realize that, one, most all

20 the time we were living in Santa Fe there was nuclear

21 waste and toxic waste being incinerated over there in

22 Los Alamos, and we are right downwind. And now that

23 they are still doing it and there's more stuff to

24 come. So, I'm speaking on behalf of my grandsons

25 also.

72

1 I feel that, one, having this talk over here

2 at this panel with one of the members of the team here

3 tonight, I was informed that any conversation, any

4 remarks made that weren't addressing these

5 alternatives wouldn't really be considered. That

6 would mean almost everything people have been talking

7 about tonight is not going to be considered. And I --

8 taking your own wording over there, I would have to

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

9 completely disagree with it, that these cannot be  
10 considered. Because the statement over there on the  
11 board about purpose of this scoping -- well, the  
12 second one actually says, "Identifying Potentially  
13 Significant Environmental Issues to be Analyzed in the  
14 Supplemental PEIS." That one is pretty easy.  
15 Plutonium, bekinel (sic), that seems like a couple of  
16 very significant things to consider right there.

17 On then the first mention over there on the  
18 board is "Identifying Reasonable Alternative to NNSA  
19 Proposed Actions," parentheses, "Complex 2030, to be  
20 analyzed in Supplemental PEIS." If we are not  
21 identifying reasonable alternatives up there, then  
22 what are we doing?

23 I can name an alternative. How about  
24 Alternative 4? This would be -- call it comply with  
25 nuclear nonproliferation treaty. Under that there is

73

1 no need to refurbish the existing weapons, which is  
2 one of the main reasons for this. I heard several  
3 reasons for this. There is no need to refurbish the  
4 weapons. They're going to be around longer than any  
5 of us. Let's see. So we need to comply with the  
6 nuclear nonproliferation treaty. It is a law of the  
7 land. When a treaty is signed and ratified it becomes  
8 part of our Constitution. That's what it says in the  
9 constitution. It becomes part of the law of the  
10 land. I notice on the board over here -- what was  
11 it -- "How We Got Here." On that time scale thing it  
12 doesn't even mention the nuclear nonproliferation  
13 treaty, and we cannot ignore and have it go away.

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

14 Any -- so, if we follow the nuclear  
15 nonproliferation treaty, a really good thing for Los  
16 Alamos to be doing before plan 2030 would be to be  
17 dismantling all the weapons, nuclear weapons like  
18 we're supposed to be doing. We are falling way behind  
19 in it, and in that process you can do any testing and  
20 evaluation of components that you felt necessary  
21 because you could be taking these things apart,  
22 dismantling them. And a major thing that could be  
23 done could be figuring out a really good, safe and  
24 environmentally sound way to deal with all that stuff  
25 when the bombs are taken apart. No new nuclear

74

1 weapons. Part of that treaty, no new nuclear  
2 weapons. And yet, they're talking about improving  
3 part of this process of 2030 would be to come up with  
4 improved nuclear weapons, and that's not even  
5 discussing the part about making new ones like the  
6 robust penetrator.

7 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: One minute, please.

8 MR. DEAN WILLIAMSON: So we shouldn't see  
9 the nuclear nonproliferation treaty as old school.  
10 It's the first step in world nuclear disarmament,  
11 which is what we really need.

12 One other just off the cuff remark, too, I  
13 was quite disappointed with the way -- the younger,  
14 the high school student was treated when he was up  
15 here. It seems the lady taking the notes and the  
16 gentleman over there felt that they could interrupt  
17 him and say, are you through now, and things like  
18 that, because they have done that to none of the other

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

19 speakers tonight. And I would like to point out, try  
20 to be more respectful of the youth. We really need to  
21 have their opinions. Thank you.

22 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Our next speaker is  
23 Oshana Spring, and she will be followed by Scott Koune  
24 and David Bacon.

25 MS. OSHANA SPRING. Hi. I just wanted to

75

1 mention to the people that are here promoting these  
2 projects, are they actually going to be living here if  
3 this project comes to fruition? I look out my window  
4 and I look up at Los Alamos and it's up there  
5 sparkling, looking beautiful at night, and then I  
6 think about what it's actually doing up there.

7 My son is in Harvard in graduate school in  
8 physics. He spent a summer up there working, and he  
9 was working on the plasma -- whatever it was -- they  
10 were very upset about funding at that point.  
11 Obviously the money is not going to energy projects,  
12 it's going to destructive projects. And it seems  
13 almost like it is a done deal. Even though they are  
14 going around the country and asking for audience  
15 participation in the areas they want to devastate, it  
16 seems like our unelected president and his puppet  
17 government are really just promoting this to help with  
18 the demise of our great country.

19 And I am still rather curious, wondering if  
20 these people have actually sold their souls or if they  
21 really think that what they are doing is somehow going  
22 to help our world, and don't they realize that we're  
23 all one, and that whatever they do to anybody around

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

24 them they are doing to themselves, to their families?

25 I mean, that's an important concept, and

76

1 it's such a small planet, and we do have in our great  
2 constitution here -- and it's in Article VI, that it  
3 says all treaties made or which shall be made under  
4 the authority of the United States shall be the  
5 supreme law of the land. And we did make this  
6 treaty. We do have a nuclear proliferation treaty.  
7 It is part of the supreme law of the land. And the  
8 United States and the stewards of the DOE are culpable  
9 in the abject violation of the supreme law of our  
10 nation.

11 And we have our Constitution. If we all  
12 rally forth and we make our elected officials realize  
13 that they have to ask -- they have taken an oath. All  
14 of our elected officials have taken an oath to uphold  
15 the Constitution. And in that Constitution, as I just  
16 spoke, we do have to uphold any laws and treaties that  
17 were made. And the nuclear proliferation treaty is  
18 part of the supreme law of the land. And all we have  
19 to do is just tell Domenici and whoever has any oomph  
20 in this that they have taken an oath to uphold our  
21 Constitution, and if they go against that, they are  
22 automatically outlaws, because it also says that in  
23 the constitution.

24 And this is our saving grace. This is the  
25 United States of America Constitution, and I know the

77

1 U.S. corporation is trying to take over and usurp all

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

2 the powers that we the people once have and we still  
3 have them. It's still here in the U.S. Constitution,  
4 and we do not have to abide by the Patriot Act or any  
5 of the acts that take away our rights and our  
6 freedoms. It's illegal, and we have to be  
7 knowledgeable about that. We have to know what our  
8 rights are, because if we don't know our rights, we  
9 don't have any.

10 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you. Our  
11 next speaker is Scott Koune, and then David Bacon and  
12 Sheri Kotowski.

13 MR. SCOTT KOVAC: Thank you. My name is  
14 Scott Kovac with Nuclear Watch New Mexico. I would  
15 just like to add a few quick points here.

16 First off, I would like NNSA to please  
17 evaluate the environmental impacts of restarting the  
18 cold war.

19 Please fully evaluate the environmental  
20 impacts of using nuclear weapons.

21 Please analyze the exact return effect that  
22 bombplex will have.

23 Please analyze the effect the bombplex 2030  
24 will have on nonproliferation.

25 Please analyze the impact of diverting at

78

1 least a 150 billion dollars in taxpayer dollars to new  
2 nuclear weapons, instead of cleaning up the massive  
3 environmental danger caused by past research and  
4 production, whether the long-term public health and  
5 ecological effect of not cleaning up radioactive and  
6 chemical contaminants that may pollute our precious

7 water resources, while new, unnecessary and at costly  
8 nuclear weapons are being built.

9 A rigorous cost analysis should verify or  
10 not DOE's that Complex 2030 will save taxpayer money.  
11 Because of its likely size and complexity, the public  
12 comment period for the Draft Complex 2030 Site-Wide  
13 Environmental Impact Statement should far exceed the  
14 minimum requirement of 45 days. I request 120 days  
15 upon the release of -- upon the release of the draft  
16 DOE -- I'm sorry, upon the release of the draft. DOE  
17 should make all cited reference documents immediately  
18 available on the Internet.

19 NNSA mentions that the existing  
20 infrastructure is not economically sustainable, but  
21 Complex 2030 will be. Please do a comprehensive  
22 economic analysis for all sites. This economic  
23 analysis must detail all aspects of all sites, not  
24 just the aspects that might be duplicative. A  
25 comprehensive inventory must be made before anyone can

79

1 really discuss reduction, consolidation or  
2 redundancy. Thank you.

3 MR. TED WYKA: Thank you.

4 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Okay. Thank you.

5 Next speaker is David Bacon, then Sheri Kotowski and  
6 Beverley Spears.

7 MR. DAVID BACON: Good evening.

8 When we run for political office you sort of  
9 learn that questions come to you and people expect you  
10 to actually work on answering those questions, and  
11 it's a challenge to actually try to boil down those

12 questions into something that actually has meaning and  
13 truth. And I think when we deal with -- with nuclear  
14 issues we often deal with parts from per million of  
15 pollution, and I think we see in our current political  
16 spectrum very few parts per million of legitimate  
17 addressing of issues of truth, maybe 100 parts per  
18 million of legitimate discussion.

19           And really, with the nuclear issue there was  
20 never a legitimate reason. The first cause was always  
21 illegitimate and continues to be so. So, we're  
22 looking at a -- at a situation of massive entropy and  
23 trying to overcome that entropy with massive amounts  
24 of dollars, massive amounts of illegitimate  
25 discussion. And really, all of the entire nuclear

80

1 complex or nuclear power, nuclear weapons, and the  
2 nuclear labs, have simply sat on the fundamental urge  
3 of humanity to have a peaceful and fruitful life on  
4 the planet.

5           Nuclear power is simply a suppression of  
6 ultimately inexpensive, easily deployed renewable  
7 energy. That's really the only purpose it serves. It  
8 never has been effective. It's always been incredibly  
9 dangerous.

10           Nuclear weapons are simply a suppression of  
11 the human urge to war in a peaceful society. They  
12 really serve no other function but to destroy and to  
13 constantly subvert that urge.

14           And the Labs themselves and the entire  
15 nuclear complex in New Mexico simply serve to suppress  
16 and distort the legitimate fundamental urge towards an

17 economy that is sustainable, peaceful and connected to  
18 the earth, to the air, to the water, and to the other  
19 people in this state.

20           And the story I'm going to read you is a  
21 story of technology. We just installed what's called  
22 a Garn woodfire boiler in Taos Pueblo. And it will be  
23 used -- it's about a nine-foot long and six-foot tall,  
24 six-foot wide hot water storage tank with a wood-fired  
25 jet engine in the center of it, and it's buried in

81

1 insulation, so about 2.1 million BTUs of heat. Taos  
2 Pueblo is going to use it to heat two 100 foot by 30  
3 foot greenhouses in their Willow Burning Center, and  
4 all this piece of technology is going to do is  
5 increasingly enhance the learning cycles in that  
6 community.

7           Taos Pueblo has 93,000 acres of woodlands  
8 that need to be thinned, and the product that comes  
9 off that woodland land can go to heat the greenhouses,  
10 can go to raise local, very healthy food, which will  
11 enhance the restaurant scene in Taos. The watershed  
12 will be enhanced by the thinning of the forest, the  
13 Taos Pueblo will be working on going off of  
14 unsustainable fossil fuel which you need to do now,  
15 and natural gas. There is almost infinite good  
16 feedback loops within one simple piece of technology.  
17 Every sustainable piece of technology has that same  
18 feedback loop inherent within it. They won't produce  
19 bad feedback. They will only produce feedback which  
20 enhances the entire community that we live in.

21           Nuclear technology will only produce

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

22 negative feedback loops, and could actually, as we all  
23 know, result in the actual destruction of the earth's  
24 community.

25 So it's inherent upon us, if we're going to

82

1 survive as a country, to switch how we think, to  
2 switch our technological focus now and focus on  
3 technology that will create positive feedback loops  
4 and increasingly intelligent ones.

5 So that's what I would urge the  
6 distinguished gentlemen here to begin to do. You are  
7 really involved in a massive entropic situation and  
8 you will never get out of it. So, we know the way out  
9 and it's -- it's completely nonnuclear. Thank you.

10 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you, sir.

11 Sheri Kotowski, then Beverley Spears and Shannyn  
12 Sollitt.

13 Ms. Kotowski, please.

14 MS. SHERI KOTOWSKI: My name is Sheri  
15 Kotowski, and I just want to thank everybody for being  
16 here. I remember seeing most of you on August the 9th  
17 on the 61st anniversary of the bombing of Nagasaki,  
18 and I think we still need to remember that's a  
19 plutonium pit. We don't need another analysis of the  
20 environmental impact. We have an analysis of an  
21 environmental impact, Nagasaki and Hiroshima.

22 I would also like to thank the DOE for my  
23 personal five minutes to express my concerns for the  
24 future of all of our children and the future of the  
25 world. Five minutes.

83

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

1 I live 60 miles away from here in the Embudo  
2 Valley. It took me over an hour to drive here. I  
3 live 30 miles away from the Los Alamos National  
4 Laboratory, directly downwind. On a windy day in the  
5 springtime, 40-mile-an-hour winds, it would take less  
6 time for the pollution from the Laboratory,  
7 resuspension, emissions to reach me than it would to  
8 drive down to this hearing. I think it's a really sad  
9 statement that people that are that profoundly  
10 affected by operations with the DOE is attempting to  
11 increase would not give those people a decent  
12 opportunity to get here and say how they feel.

13 For the SWEIS, the Site-Wide Environmental  
14 Impact Statement our communities gathered over 250  
15 cards and letters, hand-delivered them to Janet Chavez  
16 Wuzinski (sic), also sent copies to Senator Bingaman,  
17 Congressman Udall and Governor Bill Richardson. Every  
18 single one of those letters opposed the expansion of  
19 operations at the Laboratory, and this new Complex  
20 2030, all it does is want to increase it even more. I  
21 don't think those people are going to agree to it just  
22 because it's going to be more. We have already  
23 gathered 50 letters and we'll be sending them to the  
24 DOE before January 17th. I expect to at least have 10  
25 times what we already have now.

84

1 Part of what we said in those letters was to  
2 demand an alternative to the expanded operations in  
3 plutonium pit production. By the way, I would like to  
4 ask a little question about this. It's expanded  
5 operations at the Lab, and in five years it's supposed

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

6 to be 80 pits, and then now this new project says 125  
7 pits. And are you going to use the same facility? Is  
8 that going to be, like, over 200 pits, or are you,  
9 like, going to put those together and build a whole  
10 other facility to make those extra 125 pits using  
11 another, I don't know how many \$1,000,000,000,000 you  
12 plan on spending on this consolidation because nobody  
13 has even talked about exactly how much money it's  
14 going to cost.

15 As far as the alternatives, do you think  
16 that we could create security through having a world  
17 embrace what we do here in New Mexico? Don't you  
18 think people would -- would embrace us if we solve the  
19 issue of global warming? I mean, that to me would be  
20 the most profound way of creating security in this  
21 country.

22 Now, I just want to say, nuclear weapons are  
23 dangerous, expensive, boring, redundant, they don't  
24 work, they never will work, they aren't creative, and  
25 we want a creative solution not a destructive

85

1 solution. Thank you.

2 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you.

3 Beverley Spears next, Ms. Shannyn Sollitt. Okay. And  
4 James McCabe?

5 Beverley Spears? Beverley Spears here? No.

6 Is Shannyn Sollitt here? Okay. And James  
7 McCabe? James McCabe here?

8 Okay. You're next.

9 Just listing the next speakers, that's all.

10 And Ms. Leland Lehrman.

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

11 Okay. Thank you.

12 MS. SHANNYN SOLLITT: Thank you all for  
13 sticking around to the end of the hearing, and thank  
14 you for giving your full attention. I have watched  
15 you for a couple of days now, and especially to the  
16 opposition to this Complex 2030, I have written down  
17 my comments to hand in. They will also be addressed  
18 to the legislators and the press as matters of such  
19 gravity are too important in a democracy to leave to  
20 an agency of unelected officials.

21 I suggest everybody also do that because  
22 it's -- it really, in my conversations with these  
23 people, they are really the puppets of an  
24 administration, and we have to really go directly to  
25 the legislators.

86

1 As stated in your mission, it is the mandate  
2 to respond to nuclear radiological emergencies in the  
3 U.S. and abroad. This is your mission. If the  
4 Complex 2030 is allowed to go forward, it will  
5 continue to exacerbate an enormous pre-existing  
6 nuclear and radiological emergency here in New Mexico  
7 and the rest of the world. The entire nuclear weapons  
8 program has been run irresponsibly, is an  
9 environmental disaster, and is in itself a nuclear and  
10 radiological emergency. I see in your literature that  
11 your mission is to enhance national security with a  
12 military application of nuclear science, and to reduce  
13 global danger from the weapons of mass destruction.  
14 Is not this what the nuclear nonproliferation treaty  
15 ratified by the U.S. government is designed to do?

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

16 Many people have spoken about it.

17 I would just quote, It iterates, "Desiring  
18 to further the easing of international tension and  
19 strengthening of trust between states in order to  
20 facilitate the cessation of manufacture of nuclear  
21 weapons, the liquidation of all their existing  
22 stockpiles, and the elimination from national arsenals  
23 of nuclear weapons and the means of their delivery  
24 pursuant to a treaty on general and complete  
25 disarmament under strict and effective international

87

1 law." Just in case you haven't read it because I know  
2 that I have heard it mentioned probably 100 times.

3 Please explain in your response in this  
4 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement how NNSA  
5 is upholding the mission to reduce global danger of  
6 nuclear weapons by creating a new nuclear weapons  
7 production complex, thereby ignoring an international  
8 treaty to eliminate nuclear weapons.

9 Please explain why the NNSA is pursuing  
10 illegal intentions and presenting activities of  
11 nuclear proliferation, such as Complex 2030, which is  
12 clearly stated in the Constitution, Article IV, the  
13 "Laws of the United States, which will be made," I'm  
14 quoting, "in pursuance thereof; and all treaties made,  
15 or which shall be made, under the authority of the  
16 United States, shall be the supreme law of the land,"  
17 unquote. Please address this to the authority of the  
18 President and the legislators when they request that  
19 you create a bomb complex and tell them that you are  
20 bound to respect the Constitution of the United

21 States.

22 By the way, I'm wearing this white make-up  
23 because I'm representing the voices of the children of  
24 the future who are not here and are going to be deeply  
25 affected by the decisions made and carried out by the

88

1 NNSA.

2 Your literature also states that the mission  
3 of NNSA is to provide, quote, "provide safe and  
4 reliable nuclear weapons and to accomplish this in a  
5 way that protects the environment and the health and  
6 safety of the public and the workers." Please explain  
7 what is "safe" about a weapon of mass destruction.  
8 Does this mean that once it is detonated anywhere in  
9 the world that you will protect the health and the  
10 safety of the public? This is a classic oxymoron.

11 The only safe nuclear weapon is one that has  
12 been dismantled and rendered completely useless. This  
13 is the only alternative for the NNSA to pursue that  
14 would give appropriate meaning to its stated mission,  
15 and be in compliance with the supreme law of the land,  
16 and this is an alternative that is not listed.

17 This has been an admirable role of the NNSA,  
18 and a role I would advocate the NNSA wholeheartedly  
19 pursue instead of a complex to build more weapons.  
20 You have a serious and complex problem on your hands  
21 to find out how to manage all the plutonium and the  
22 other nuclear materials from dismantled weapons. How  
23 do you expect to manage these incredibly toxic and  
24 dangerous materials? This is such a serious  
25 environmental and national security problem. I

1 request that this be the, quote, "reasonable  
2 alternative." I would like to see it addressed in the  
3 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

4           You state that the NNSA is protecting the  
5 U.S. from the threat of an adverse change in the  
6 global political climate. I ask you to take into  
7 consideration an adverse change in the American  
8 political climate. It has a president that has led us  
9 into an illegal and immoral war and has done so in the  
10 face of unprecedented opposition from the U.S.  
11 citizens and the world. We witnessed his, quote,  
12 "shock and awe over Baghdad," the ultimate act of a  
13 state-sponsored terrorist act against a defenseless  
14 country, and accepted that we were fighting a war on  
15 terrorism.

16           In the hands of this president or another  
17 who might be able to fraudulently find themselves in  
18 office, which many believe has happened in this  
19 country, there is a frightening potential that the  
20 largest nuclear arsenal in the world in the possession  
21 of a president like President Bush, who erodes the  
22 checks and balances in the Constitution, could mean  
23 the ruination of the entire world.

24           MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: May I ask you to  
25 summarize your comments, please?

1           MS. SHANNYN SOLLITT: Okay.

2           MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: And please turn in  
3 your typed copy for us?

4 MS. SHANNYN SOLLITT: If the responsibility  
5 for protecting the U.S. from this adverse change would  
6 be under the mandate of the NNSA, then I strongly  
7 suggest the NNSA factor this now obvious potential  
8 eventuality into your concerns and do all in its power  
9 to limit the adverse effect of this potential.

10 The rest of this has to do with the  
11 environmental effects which, of course, have been  
12 iterated earlier. What are you going to do about the  
13 12,500 drums of waste buried up in Los Alamos since  
14 1971? Why would any rational agency want to put a  
15 nuclear weapons production facility on top of a  
16 wind-swept mountain in the middle of a wildfire zone  
17 at the source of a watershed that serves 10,000,000  
18 people. Please answer this.

19 As an alternative to Complex 2030 and all  
20 the alternatives presented by NNSA, I request that  
21 NNSA immediately respond to the nuclear and  
22 radiological emergency here in the state of New Mexico  
23 and the world. The reasonable and necessary  
24 alternative I propose is that the NNSA insist upon the  
25 massive cleanup of contaminated areas, support

91

1 research in the remediation of radioactive waste, and  
2 find the means to make reparations to those  
3 communities whose soil, air and water have been  
4 contaminated.

5 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Excuse me.

6 MS. SHANNYN SOLLITT: This is the most  
7 important work that can be done by a nuclear lab and  
8 for the generation who will be bearing children in the

9 year 2030. Thank you.

10 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Just have a seat  
11 and we'll go on to our next one. The next one is  
12 James McCabe, to be followed by Leland Lehrman and  
13 Willem Malten.

14 MR. JAMES McCABE: Good evening. Thank  
15 you. I would like to take a moment to give thanks to  
16 our Creator, to Grandmother Turtle who provides us  
17 with sustenance, so that we live here in peace.

18 Okay. And also, give thanks to the spirit  
19 of community of those upon whose land we are living,  
20 because after 500 years I feel that we're still --  
21 we're still pilgrims here.

22 My name is James McCabe. I was born on the  
23 4th of July, 1945. A month later our government  
24 chose, in spite of the fact that the Japanese  
25 government had already agreed to unconditional

92

1 surrender, to let loose Fat Boy and rain hell upon the  
2 people of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

3 I'm a Vietnam veteran. I was a flight  
4 medic. I volunteered, and unlike the squatter at 1600  
5 Pennsylvania Avenue, I showed up. My parents always  
6 told me that they were very proud of the fact that  
7 their twin sons all volunteered to serve their  
8 country, and we did so without question. And as  
9 Clarissa pointed out in talking about her ancestors,  
10 First Nations people have always been the first to  
11 volunteer to defend this country, not the government,  
12 but the sacred land. And I'm sorry I don't have a  
13 written delivery here, because quite frankly, I am

14 humbled by my elders who have spoken before me. And I  
15 am in awe of the youth that have spoken here with such  
16 wisdom today.

17 I would like to ask some questions,  
18 Mr. Wyka. I want you to understand that I don't come  
19 here to assassinate character. I just come here to  
20 understand. Your title, sir, is what?

21 MR. TED WYKA: It was in the presentation.  
22 The Document Manager.

23 MR. JAMES McCABE: And your educational  
24 background?

25 MR. TED WYKA: Just go ahead and submit your

93

1 questions to the record.

2 MR. JAMES McCABE: I'm just trying to  
3 understand --

4 MR. TED WYKA: Sir, I understand.

5 MR. JAMES McCABE: -- understand where he is  
6 coming from.

7 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: As I explained  
8 earlier, there will not be dialogue. If you want to  
9 talk to him afterwards you may -- to get personal  
10 information you may, but I would call that out of  
11 order right now.

12 MR. JAMES McCABE: Well, the reason I asked  
13 that was that he made a statement about the Draft  
14 Supplement. You pointed out that the Supplement is  
15 summary based on existing policy and procedure. Did I  
16 understand you correctly there?

17 MR. TED WYKA: Yes.

18 MR. JAMES McCABE: Okay. The problem I have

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

19 with that is that from the moment we unleashed nuclear  
20 power on the rest of the world we have never gotten it  
21 right, and our policy has never been founded on the  
22 wisdom or knowledge or understanding. After  
23 60-something years, I cannot help but feel that your  
24 industry is still groping in the dark. You haven't  
25 the faintest idea as to the cosmic power with which

94

1 you are meddling. And rather than concentrate on  
2 harnessing the peaceful applications of what the  
3 creator has provided for us, you insist on trying to  
4 sell us into a self-obliterating pattern. It doesn't  
5 work that way. It never has.

6           You know, if you study the history of war as  
7 an example, the great Chinese General Sun Tzu, and the  
8 great ronin, the Japanese ronin, Miyamoto Musashi of  
9 the 16th century, these men wrote classics that are  
10 still being studied by the war college, by the  
11 military academies of this country and by industry,  
12 because these great tacticians and savages, and actual  
13 warriors -- Musashi was never defeated, and he lived  
14 until the age of 70. He was a master Samurai, and he  
15 had national status in Tokugawa, Japan. But like all  
16 the great chiefs of indigenous peoples around the  
17 world, Sun Tzu and/or Sensei Musashi understood that  
18 peace is the only way, and we really need to get off  
19 this self destructive path.

20           MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: I'm going to ask  
21 you to finish up in a minute.

22           MR. JAMES McCABE: Yes, sir.

23           This past Veterans Day we celebrated the

24 first birthday of my first grandchild, Maren  
25 Elizabeth, arguably one of the world's most beautiful

95

1 babies. Her other grandmother recently related a  
2 story that she has been teaching Maren sign language,  
3 and that she didn't understand Maren because Maren was  
4 signing -- giving a sign for hat, and looking off at a  
5 particular bookshelf. And then finally she realized  
6 that my picture was there wearing one of my cowboy  
7 hats. And when Maren is a young woman, I want her to  
8 understand that her Tunkasila, her grandfather, was a  
9 veteran, but more importantly, that he is a veteran  
10 for peace who spent his senior years working to  
11 provide her and her grandfather with a better world.  
12 Tunkasila Mitakuye Oyasin. We are all related.

13 MR. TED WYKA: Thank you.

14 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: I just want to make  
15 a comment here. It is not my pleasure to cut people  
16 off. We have had several people run nine or ten  
17 minutes, and I am sorry that for those of you who are  
18 at the end of the line who are now at least an hour  
19 away from speaking, so I am trying to move things  
20 along so everyone has a chance to speak at a  
21 reasonable hour.

22 The next speaker would be Leland Lehrman,  
23 and he would be followed by Willem Malten and  
24 Dr. Steve Spencer, please.

25 MR. LELAND LEHRMAN: Santa Fe for president.

96

1 I have been involved actively in politics  
2 for a couple of years, and I see that here in Santa Fe

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

3 we have the potential to make a change. There's no  
4 question about it. The nuclear industry is going to  
5 go away. I can see that now. There will be a few  
6 struggles along the way, but it's basically over now.

7           There was a time when I was pronuclear.  
8 That was a long time ago in my life standards, when I  
9 was 11 or 12 or 10 or so. I remember getting up on  
10 stage at my all boys school in New York City, my  
11 private all boys school, and telling everybody there  
12 that we needed more nukes than the Russians because  
13 otherwise they were going to take over Western Europe  
14 and we were going to end up with our heads under our  
15 school desks. And I was dead serious. I was  
16 convinced. And I remember looking at the graphs in  
17 Time Magazine and numbers of nuclear weapons on both  
18 sides as assessed by various members of the  
19 intelligence community who have recently become our  
20 secretaries of defense and subsequently have been,  
21 fortunately, deposed.

22           And in my Republican family -- and I love my  
23 family very much -- to make sure that that's all very  
24 clear -- a gentleman came in, through the devices of  
25 my sister who had fell in love with him as a result of

97

1 his beautiful piano playing at her nursery school, and  
2 convinced my parents to hire her -- hire him as my  
3 piano teacher. And I was lecturing this piano teacher  
4 about the need for more nuclear weapons, and the fact  
5 that the Commies were going to overrun us any minute  
6 now. And he looked at me with a great deal of  
7 compassion and he said, do you mean that you really

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

8 think that nuclear weapons are a good thing? And I  
9 think that was maybe the first time in my entire life  
10 when I questioned everything that I had ever thought  
11 on the subject of military foreign policy and nuclear  
12 policy. And as I considered the distinguished  
13 gentlemen with us today, I wonder if there might be a  
14 piano teacher in their future. Not -- not -- because  
15 I hope so, but obviously it can't be forced. But I  
16 hope so.

17           Let's make no mistake. The strategic  
18 command was ordered by Dick Cheney to come up with a  
19 nuclear bunker buster attack for war with Iran at a  
20 moment's notice.

21           Another former Republican CIA agent by the  
22 name of Philip Giraldi had the sense to leak that  
23 information to the American Conservatives. Let's make  
24 no mistake. The issue of war, nuclear war is not a  
25 partisan issue. We must stop all nuclear development,

98

1 period.

2           The point was made earlier, and it was also  
3 raised by some of the speakers, that these issues were  
4 not going to be addressed by the Site-Wide  
5 Environmental Impact Statement, or whatever the name  
6 of the current environmental impact statement is,  
7 because the policy to Bush Administration is to  
8 develop these nuclear weapons. And I just make a  
9 point that although that may be the case, the option  
10 still is on the table for anybody currently working on  
11 the Environmental Impact Statement to decide to quit  
12 their jobs and perhaps join Nuclear Watch or CCNS.

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

13 I'm sure they would hire you in a minute --

14 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: One minute, please.

15 MR. LELAND LEHRMAN: -- because they have a  
16 great deal of experience.

17 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: One minute, please.

18 MR. LELAND LEHRMAN: I'm completely serious  
19 about that. And it's certainly an option.

20 The -- the Soviet threat which we were  
21 petrified with turns out to have been largely  
22 fabricated, as the Soviet nuclear arsenal was much  
23 smaller than it was projected to be and Paul Wolfowitz  
24 and Donald Rumsfeld and the neoconservatives on team B  
25 have been exposed recently by former CIA officers as

99

1 Like Melvin Goodman and Ray McGovern as having  
2 manufactured intelligence regarding nuclear  
3 capabilities of the Soviet Union for the purposes of  
4 scaring the American people into continuing the  
5 nuclear administration and the nuclear weapons  
6 facilities. This is par for the course. This is the  
7 way the nuclear weapons industry has operated probably  
8 since its inception. The main argument for the  
9 nuclear weapons industry is it hurts people, the point  
10 is to terrorize them into doing what we are told to  
11 do. There is a very small handful of elite people and  
12 a few people who have decided to believe the  
13 propaganda, who are willing to go along with this and,  
14 quite frankly, their time is up.

15 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you. Willem  
16 Malten and Steve Spencer and Astrid Webster.

17 MR. WILLEM MALTEN: My name is Willem  
Page 83

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

18 Malten. I'm very glad to be here with all of you.  
19 And I am always blown away by the wisdom of we, the  
20 people, and many remarks have been very profound. I  
21 want to really follow up a little bit on the directive  
22 of Greg Mello saying that in many ways, you know, this  
23 Complex 2030 is not what we should focus on. It's  
24 kind of a smokescreen. Complex 2030 is really very  
25 simple. It won't happen, and it won't happen because

100

1 of you.

2           What we really need to know here in this  
3 area is that what is really being planned behind the  
4 smokescreen of Complex 2030 is a building, a new  
5 building in Los Alamos. It's called the CMRR  
6 building, and its plan to produce between 80 and 125  
7 nuclear pits per year, possibly going up to 200  
8 nuclear pits per year. This is our problem here in  
9 this area, and this is really the mission of Los  
10 Alamos under the new management of Bechtel and the  
11 University of California.

12           Now, I want to talk just a little bit about  
13 this, this whole complex there in Los Alamos now.  
14 First of all, what does it mean to privatize the  
15 production of nuclear pits in Los Alamos? It means  
16 that it will be run much more like a for-profit  
17 corporate entity. This is very dangerous for our  
18 area. This is very dangerous for the people of the  
19 world, and we need to resist this.

20           Privatization also means that, really, that  
21 in Los Alamos there's going to be less work in Los  
22 Alamos. The true vision between RRW, the reliable

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

23 replacement warheads, is really that in this building,  
24 the CMRR building, there will be a bunch of robots  
25 messing around with plutonium pits. You don't need to

101

1 have too many scientists to make this work happen. As  
2 a matter of fact, the science at Los Alamos in a way  
3 is in the way. It costs money, it's not productive.  
4 What is productive is have a nuclear mission that will  
5 absorb a lot of money, federal monies that come in  
6 here and will perpetuate the corporation and will work  
7 for the shareholders of that corporation.

8           So, we already -- you know, Bechtel, I don't  
9 know how long they have been busy, but we already  
10 heard that there was 300, possibly 600 layoffs in Los  
11 Alamos. We think that pretty soon, within two to  
12 three years, there would be actually about 1,200  
13 layoffs in Los Alamos. This is actually an  
14 opportunity for us. We often hear it said and we  
15 heard it said here tonight, that why can't we change  
16 Los Alamos? Why can't we make good use of all these  
17 good minds there? But again, as Greg Mello mentioned,  
18 between 75 percent and 80 percent of the work done in  
19 Los Alamos currently is related to nuclear weapon  
20 production one way or another. We should not have any  
21 illusion, illusions about that fact. Instead, what we  
22 need to concentrate on is the positive part of this.  
23 We have 600 to 1,200 layoffs at Los Alamos. We need  
24 to keep these people here.

25           We need to provide and start thinking about

102

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

1 alternate economic development, alternate energy  
2 development, like Mr. Bacon mentioned so eloquently,  
3 and we need to start making use of these people in  
4 creating a future that is so attractive, even  
5 financially, but let alone financially, community and  
6 environmentally, so attractive that it actively  
7 competes with this dead end ideology that is being  
8 proposed again and again and again, and now is written  
9 into this data called 2030 Complex.

10 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: One minute, please.

11 MR. WILLEM MALTEN: This is all, really, I  
12 have to say, and it's -- I am saying this to you  
13 because it's up to us, really, here to expose the  
14 fraudulent nature of the nuclear weapons industry from  
15 the very start to now. We need to expose it all the  
16 time. We need to expose the security breaches. We  
17 need to talk about it a lot in our own communities,  
18 like Greg mentioned, and we need to make a difference  
19 that we're looking for. Thank you.

20 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Before you start,  
21 we're going to take Dr. Spencer and then Astrid  
22 Webster and then we'll have a short break and finish  
23 up after that. Dr. Spencer, it's your call.

24 DR. STEVE SPENCER: Thank you. My name is  
25 Steven Spencer. I'm a physician. I'm not here to

103

1 represent any group or any other people. I am  
2 expressing my own opinion, but I hope that it is the  
3 opinion of many. And I want to begin by thanking  
4 Mr. Ted Wyka for your very educational presentation,  
5 which gave a lot of technical details of an expanded

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

6 program. But I must say that -- and I also thank you  
7 for your patience and your endurance over these  
8 several hours. But I must say that you and I are not  
9 on the same page, explaining technical details of an  
10 expanding program that I really can't endorse, and I  
11 basically -- I don't really agree with the basic  
12 assumptions.

13           You know, folks, some things take on a life  
14 of their own. The nuclear arms race is one such  
15 thing. I was frankly alarmed, even sickened when I  
16 read about this program, because I had naively thought  
17 that the Lab was on a path away from weapons of mass  
18 destruction and on a path towards peaceful development  
19 of science, peaceful applications of science.

20           We are asked here to talk about an  
21 Environmental Impact Statement, and I am thinking of  
22 it more in terms of a global human impact statement.  
23 What kind of environment are we asked to address?

24           The nuclear arms race probably made some  
25 sense during the Cold War. We had our bomb shelters,

104

1 our fallout shelters and so on. It now makes no sense  
2 except to those who stand to make a lot of money from  
3 it.

4           Some things take on a life of their own and  
5 become very difficult to kill. We have an enormous  
6 national debt in this country, and some very, very  
7 important needs -- affordable health care, affordable  
8 housing and so on. So I just ask, do we really want  
9 to spend billions and billions of dollars on making  
10 Los Alamos the national capital of nuclear insanity?

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

11 Thank you.

12 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you,  
13 Mr. Spencer. The next speaker is Astrid Webster.

14 MS. ASTRID WEBSTER: My name is Astrid.  
15 This is my third meeting like this in three days.  
16 Everybody has been eloquent and wonderful and really  
17 nice, and I intend to be naughty.

18 I don't think that we have really been  
19 heard. Despite saying two times already that the FBI,  
20 not the DOE, closed Rocky Flats for egregious safety  
21 violations, the NNSA still insists on saying they  
22 closed it.

23 At least two dozen people recommended  
24 Alternative 4. As you see over there, there are still  
25 three alternatives. This is an example of rigidity

105

1 that allows, after the penetrating bunker buster was  
2 defeated, that reappears in the incarnation of Divine  
3 Strake global strike nuclear warhead. For heaven's  
4 sakes, all they have to do is add the radionuclides.  
5 That's all.

6 I feel like we are in the nuclear free  
7 speech zone. We are speaking to the New Mexico  
8 desert. So I am not going to say that this is -- what  
9 I am about to read to you comes from Carol Cohn, who  
10 is a senior research fellow at the Center for  
11 Psychological Studies in the Nuclear Age.

12 "You have heard of Fat Man and Little Boy.  
13 Did you know that one of them was Oppenheimer's baby,  
14 and the other one was Edward Teller's baby? Nuclear  
15 weapon as an industry has been inhabited mostly by

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

16 men, to turn into the word terror, is used as a  
17 justification." When Carol Cohn heard the language of  
18 the nuclear weapons industry she found that she, too,  
19 could not conceive of peace.

20           Techno-strategic language, she called it,  
21 precludes the concept of peace. It enables infinite  
22 talk about nuclear holocaust without ever facing its  
23 speaker, forcing its speaker or enabling the listener  
24 to touch on the reality behind the words. For  
25 example, how can you look at a picture of Hiroshima

106

1 and Nagasaki and speak of clean bombs, as though the  
2 only dirty thing about it was the radioactivity?

3           Release -- a clean bomb releases larger  
4 amounts of energy in a blast and less in  
5 radioactivity. Okay. Human death is called  
6 collateral damage. When the MX missile was renamed  
7 the Peacekeeper by Ronald Reagan, using that with  
8 scorn, but calling it a damage limitation weapon was  
9 okay. I guess it's crazy.

10           You know this is happening. Pete Domenici  
11 loves these people, and as far as I'm concerned, it's  
12 someone loving unstable people who are working with  
13 unstable materials.

14           Women have said that the arms race is a  
15 phallic worship. Helen Caldecott called it missile  
16 envy, but Helen was astonished at the unabashed sexual  
17 references as a part of the daily techno-speak. For  
18 example, irresistible, bold weapons giving you more  
19 bang for the buck. To quote a National Security  
20 Council advisor, releasing 70 to 80 percent of our

21 megatonnage in one orgasmic whomp. This is what we're  
22 talking about is another orgasmic whomp.

23 I want the only hot thing happening in New  
24 Mexico until 2030 is the phone lines to our elected  
25 officials who have jumped ship to join the rats who

107

1 are being paid for what they do. Call them up and  
2 tell them no. The CMMR building is not yet fully  
3 designed and they had a groundbreaking ceremony and  
4 they are building it. Are you outraged yet? They  
5 don't even have it planned and it's going on.

6 It's endless. Okay. The history of the  
7 atomic bomb project itself is ripe with overt images  
8 of competitive male sexuality. What do you suppose  
9 the vectored thrust capability that makes the unique  
10 rapid response possible could be?

11 It goes on. It's sickening. The homeland  
12 of the aggressed has just been devastated by the  
13 explosion of say 100 -- excuse me, 1,000 nuclear  
14 bombs, each likely at least to be 10 to 100 times more  
15 powerful than the bomb dropped on Hiroshima. The  
16 aggressor, whose homeland is still untouched, ends up  
17 worse off. They just blew their wad and they feel  
18 sorry for it.

19 The safeguard of strategic paradigms are the  
20 weapons, thus NNSA, the Nuclear Safety Administration,  
21 folks, they are not trying to make you safe. They are  
22 trying to make their bombs safe.

23 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: One minute, please.

24 MS. ASTRID WEBSTER: Most people who do this  
25 work are on the whole nice, even good men, with many

1 liberal inclinations. While they often identify their  
2 motivation as being concerned about humans, in their  
3 work they enter a paradigm that precludes people. I  
4 have a couple of examples there. One is the bomb, and  
5 they talk about padding the bomb. Another one is of a  
6 baby nursing with a mother, and that's collateral  
7 damage. Our kids are really in trouble unless we stop  
8 these people. They are not, the people who are  
9 listening to this are not getting what is being  
10 unanimously said, except for two people from Carlsbad  
11 who are being paid.

12 In the past two days, no nuclear pit  
13 production, no CMMR, not now, not ever, not in 2030,  
14 but today, tomorrow, and next week are the times that  
15 matter. You know, this is almost about -- a few years  
16 ago we heard about the shuck wife and the power wife.  
17 We have now the shuck nukes and the power nukes, and  
18 we need to say, absolutely not to this egregious  
19 immorality. We don't need any more nuclear weapons.  
20 We don't need any more nuclear wet dreams in New  
21 Mexico. We need to stop this adolescent behavior and  
22 start investing in life science and humanity and not  
23 weapons of mass death. Thank you.

24 MR. TED WYKA: Thank you.

25 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Okay. Knowing that

1 I may have to wrap with -- Miss Chin, I'm hoping we  
2 can make this four minutes, five minutes, something  
3 like that. We still have 11 people to speak, and the  
4 first three people who will speak when we come back

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

5 are Elizabeth Baker, Marvin Van Diller and Jessica  
6 Willbanks.

7 Now, I also understand we are supposed to be  
8 out of this building at midnight. We'll make it  
9 everyone stays at five minutes. So I appreciate  
10 that. We're going to take a five-minute break now,  
11 and we'll be back and finish up.

12 (A recess was taken.)

13 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Now, I understand  
14 that one of the speakers that I called for may have  
15 left. Marvin Van Diller here? Okay. If not, is  
16 Elizabeth Baker --

17 MS. ELIZABETH BAKER: Yes, I'm here.

18 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Okay. And then  
19 following Elizabeth Baker, Jessica Willbanks and  
20 Elizabeth Stow. Is Elizabeth Stow here?

21 Well, we're going down the list. Joni  
22 Arends?

23 Okay. Great. Ms. Baker, please?

24 MS. ELIZABETH BAKER: Well, it's late, and I  
25 almost left an hour and a half ago. But I heard my

110

1 own granddaughter, who lives here now in Santa Fe. In  
2 my head I have heard Kyra Valentine say, well, what  
3 did you do, Yuppa? And it reminded me of 1984 when my  
4 two sons and I saw a movie together. I'm a filmmaker  
5 and a writer, and we saw a movie together called  
6 Testament, and we walked out of the theater, and my  
7 two sons said to me, what are you going to do, Mother,  
8 and what have you done about stopping the bomb. And  
9 then I produced an event in San Francisco called Voter

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

10 '84 and raised \$80,000 for the freeze, to support  
11 candidates that were voting against the bomb.

12           And now here we are again, and I cannot  
13 believe I am here at this microphone talking to you,  
14 not because I think that that is the most important  
15 thing to do tonight. I think the most important thing  
16 to do tonight is to go home and really start working  
17 now that I realize that we are right back where we  
18 were how many years ago stopping the bomb. And I  
19 would tell you that I don't know about men who will do  
20 it, but women are going to stop this bomb and they are  
21 going to stop the very insane idea that this is the  
22 very last war, because this war is going to stop all  
23 other wars forever. We have heard that. It's never  
24 been true, it's never going to be true.

25           The bomb is not making a us safer. It's

111

1 just about money, and there is a tipping point that is  
2 happening about consciousness on this planet right  
3 now, and if you don't believe it, just think back a  
4 few weeks ago to when it was finally time for the  
5 American people to wake up and get off their duffs and  
6 go vote. And I cheered madly at -- up all night  
7 watching those elections come in, and at one point on  
8 one news station, which I don't even remember now, the  
9 announcer was saying, well, if they only could win  
10 this Senate race they actually would take back the  
11 Senate. And at that very moment he suddenly looked at  
12 his board again and saw that the Democrats were  
13 winning that race.

14           And I want to say publicly that I don't

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

15 think it had anything to do with Republicans or  
16 Democrats. I think it had to do with the American  
17 people who suddenly realized that they are a free  
18 people, they get to vote, they get to do the wise  
19 thing and that maybe America has somehow wandered far  
20 afield from the country that we all grew up thinking  
21 we were living in.

22 I say no to 2030. I say no more bombs. I  
23 say no plutonium pits. And I say that my  
24 granddaughter is not going to be living 40 miles from  
25 a lab that is doing such an outrageously destructive

112

1 thing. I am not going to be living there. And  
2 somehow, some way, goodness has to prevail now. We  
3 have to not do this. We have to stop. I have to  
4 stop -- if only -- I am the only one in the world, I  
5 have to stop this from happening. There is no way  
6 that this is going to make us safer. We need  
7 schools. We need health care. We need to return to  
8 American values, and building another building at Los  
9 Alamos, starting to make more pits for bombs when we  
10 have such a proliferation of them now is just not  
11 going to do it.

12 So, I stayed, Kyra Valentine, until midnight  
13 to say no, and now, I'm going to go home and I'm going  
14 to start working just as hard as I did when I started  
15 working 20 or 30 years ago to stop this madness. My  
16 vote is no.

17 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you.  
18 Elizabeth Stow? Joni Arends? Following Ms. Arends  
19 will be R. A. Wakeland, and if that's not possible,

20 Monica Steinhoff.

21 MS. JONI ARENDS: Good evening, all. My  
22 name is Joni Arends. I'm with the Concerned Citizens  
23 for Nuclear Safety. DOE has stated that the need for  
24 this building is because the plutonium pits are old.  
25 DOE has stated that the need for this complex is

113

1 because plutonium pits are aging, and has been  
2 mentioned many times tonight, that the JASONS released  
3 the report last week stating that they are not as --  
4 aging as quickly, and that we have the opportunity to  
5 have a public debate. Someone said earlier 70 years,  
6 we have 70 years to be able to have that conversation.

7 So, CCNS says DOE needs to go back to the  
8 drawing board, consider all the scoping comments that  
9 they have received and come back to us with a new  
10 proposal. This whole system, this whole NEPA process  
11 needs to stop now, and they need to go back to the  
12 drawing board and start over and come back to us with  
13 proposals like those that have been proposed tonight,  
14 including Scott of Nuke Watch and their expanded  
15 global security alternative.

16 I want to talk about Don Hancock's and  
17 Shannyn's Constitutional alternative where DOE  
18 explains how the proposed Complex 2030 complies not  
19 only with Article VI of the U.S. Constitution, which  
20 states that the treaties are the supreme law of the  
21 land, but also with Article VI of the Nuclear  
22 Nonproliferation Treaty. The DOE must analyze the  
23 impacts for the eventual elimination of nuclear  
24 weapons in the draft SWEIS -- S-PEIS.

25 The NOI states that, quote, "nuclear

114

1 deterrent will continue to be a cornerstone of U. S.  
2 national security policy," end of quote. As stated  
3 earlier, this is not the policy that many Americans  
4 support, so therefore, DOE must analyze for the range  
5 of impacts for using a nuclear weapon, and this  
6 analysis must include use of the smallest nuclear  
7 weapon in the arsenal to the largest. We want to see  
8 those numbers. We want to see what happens if a  
9 nuclear weapon is exploded how many people are going  
10 to die in the most concentrated populations. We want  
11 to see the gory details and more. And if you are  
12 planning to put forward a proposal to use to -- as a  
13 deterrent, then let's see what that deterrent is.  
14 Spell it out, put it in your tables and let's see it.

15 Okay. The NOI also says that, "The  
16 replacement warhead design concepts may be pursued  
17 under other alternatives," end of quote. If this is  
18 the case, then the environmental impacts for all  
19 replacement warhead design concepts must be analyzed  
20 for in the draft SWEIS -- S-PEIS, whatever it is  
21 called. It's the PEIS, the SEIS. How can the  
22 American people understand what's being proposed?

23 We want to see a no action alternative that  
24 is truly a no action alternative, one where DOE gets  
25 no further action and cleans up the contamination that

115

1 is spreading through the air, flowing in surface, in  
2 groundwater and is being buried under disposal sites

3 throughout the complex. If DOE chooses the no action  
4 alternative as a status quo, as it says on these  
5 documents over here, then DOE needs to provide the  
6 legal justification for providing -- for not providing  
7 a real no action alternative. We're tired of seeing  
8 these documents that come forward that say that the no  
9 action alternative is the status quo. I want to see  
10 the legal justification for why DOE is saying that the  
11 status quo is not action alternative. And I'm  
12 rambling. It's late.

13 Okay. So, then, the NOI also states that,  
14 quote, "Any decisions made pursuant to the LANL  
15 Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement will be  
16 included in the Complex 2030 S-PEIS," end of quote.  
17 So the draft SEIS must explain a timeline for the two  
18 documents. We don't want to get into a situation  
19 where we have the Complex 2030 going forward and then  
20 having the ROD for the LANL SWEIS come out, and those  
21 things not be cohesive. We don't want a situation  
22 where LANL puts forward or DOE puts forward in the  
23 draft LANL SWEIS draft documents to support  
24 assumptions and conclusions in that report. We want  
25 things to be clear, clean, clean, a clean document.

116

1 And Kallia said earlier, the SSM PEIS was  
2 made over a decade ago and you're tearing off of that  
3 for this process, and has DOE ever provided, has any  
4 federal agency put forward a supplement to an EIS ten  
5 years later and say that it's still a good analysis?  
6 I would like you to explain in the document the  
7 justification for using a document that's ten years

8 old when change circumstances have happened over this  
9 decade.

10 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: One minute, please.

11 MS. JONI ARENDS: I'm going to finish saying  
12 what I need to say.

13 Okay. Let's talk about other issues.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Give her all the time  
15 she needs. She is a very important person in this  
16 community. She is working very hard. She needs --

17 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Sorry, I'm  
18 moderating the meeting. There will be plenty of time  
19 for her to speak later after other people, who have  
20 been waiting for four hours, have a chance to speak.  
21 Please continue.

22 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Excuse me. I would  
23 like to give my time to Joni.

24 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: I'm afraid you  
25 can't do that.

117

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Why not?

2 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Because I said so.  
3 If she wants to -- if she wants to come through and  
4 finish what she has and there's time left she can come  
5 back. You don't have to give up your time.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I want to give it up.

7 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: You may give it  
8 up --

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I have the  
10 prerogative. You can't tell me what to do, sir.

11 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Please continue.

12 MS. JONI ARENDS: Okay. So, I'm going to

13 speak now about LANL, and then I want to talk about  
14 the environmental impact by LANL.

15 MR. TED WYKA: Take the time you need.

16 MS. JONI ARENDS: So the NOI mentions that  
17 LANL may be the location for expanded pit production  
18 as well as the Consolidated Plutonium Center. LANL  
19 needs to be cleaned up now. And the reason for that  
20 is because of contamination to water, to air, and then  
21 the disposal issue.

22 All of these activities with the expanded  
23 pit production as well as the Consolidated Plutonium  
24 Center will generate more transuranic waste, for which  
25 there is no disposal pathway. So as explained in the

118

1 comments of Southwest Research and Information Center  
2 about the draft LANL SWEIS, generation of additional  
3 transuranic waste at LANL would result in the  
4 long-term indefinite storage and disposal of  
5 transuranic waste at LANL. Expanded operations  
6 alternative in the draft LANL Site-Wide Environmental  
7 Impact Statement states that more than 2,500 cubic  
8 feet -- cubic meters -- 25,000 cubic meters of  
9 transuranic waste would be generated -- would be  
10 generated, which may be concurrent with the  
11 transuranic waste that is generated with the  
12 activities of this Complex 2030 proposal.

13 However, under the recent recertification  
14 application, it states that there's only 1,700 and --  
15 17,130 cubic meters of disposal capacity for LANL  
16 waste at WIPP. So the disposal -- which is the  
17 disposal location for this transuranic waste. So

18 therefore, any transuranic waste that's being  
19 generated now at LANL does not have a pathway forward  
20 for disposal. And so that waste is going to continue  
21 to stay at LANL for a long-term storage and disposal.  
22 And it's as people have talked about, that's going to  
23 be in Area G, that's going to be in the tents, that's  
24 going to be in a location subject to wildfire as well  
25 as terrorist attacks.

119

1 So with regard to the groundwater, the DOE's  
2 Office of the Inspector General responded to  
3 allegations about the wells constructed at LANL to  
4 characterize the hydrogeologic conditions of  
5 oversight, and because of the poor well construction,  
6 groundwater samples that are being collected are not  
7 representative of those conditions. And that DOE  
8 inspection -- Inspector General Inspection Report,  
9 Characterization Wells at LANL, and it's DOE/IG-0703,  
10 it was put out in September of 2005. And the  
11 Inspector General found the following. DOE is not in  
12 compliance with DOE order 450.1, Environmental  
13 Protection Program, which requires LANL to have a  
14 groundwater surveillance monitoring program in place  
15 by December 31st, 2005. So they're not in compliance  
16 with that. So it's almost a year later and they are  
17 still not in compliance with that.

18 Number two, LANL did not adhere to specific  
19 constraints established by the Environmental  
20 Protection Agency for the use of drilling methods,  
21 using mud or other drilling fluids, and because they  
22 didn't follow the EPA rules, DOE cannot assure that

23 the certain residual of drilling fluids were fully  
24 removed.

25 So what we're getting is number three, the

120

1 muds and other drilling fluids that remain in certain  
2 wells after construction created a chemical  
3 environment that could mask the presence of  
4 radionuclide contamination and compromise -- compromise  
5 the reliability of groundwater contamination data.

6 Now, so, as a result of their lack of  
7 complying with the law, and the fact that they are  
8 continuing to collect the samples that are not  
9 representative -- unrepresentative, from these wells,  
10 there's problems, but nevertheless, despite these  
11 problems there still has been breakthroughs of  
12 contamination, such as the hexavalent chromium in R-28  
13 well. And that was reported in the local newspapers  
14 this morning, and the levels of hexavalent chromium  
15 continue to rise above both the EPA the New Mexico  
16 standards. They continue to rise. And we have  
17 arrogant statements by DOE saying that it's going to  
18 be okay because when it gets to the drinking water  
19 supply, we're going to be able to treat it. And who  
20 is going to pay for that?

21 Okay. So --

22 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Before you go any  
23 further, you are now closing in on 15 minutes. If  
24 everyone else takes 15 minutes we'll be late. What I  
25 would like to do is to ask, first of all, if the other

121

1 people who are still here --

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

2 MS. JONI ARENDS: I have --

3 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Just a minute.

4 Whether they are speaking, that they would mind having

5 you finish before they have a chance to speak. Is

6 Mr. Wakel and here?

7 MS. JONI ARENDS: I have one more comment,

8 sir.

9 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Just one second.

10 Is Mr. Wakel and here?

11 Is Ms. Monica Steinhoff here?

12 Okay. Virginia Miller?

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is not here.

14 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: She is not here?

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would like to

16 speak.

17 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: You would like to

18 speak also?

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would like Joni to

20 finish.

21 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Would you like to

22 speak also?

23 Okay. Linda Hibbs?

24 MS. LINDA HIBBS: I release my time to Joni.

25 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: We're going to be

122

1 as fair as possible. Elliot Skinner?

2 MR. ELLIOTT SKINNER: Here.

3 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Is it all right if

4 she continues or do you want to --

5 MR. ELLIOTT SKINNER: I'm learning a lot.

6 Thank you very much.

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

7 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Michael Brace?  
8 MR. MICHAEL BRACE: Here.  
9 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: The same?  
10 MR. MICHAEL BRACE: Same.  
11 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Okay. Now we have  
12 got at least four other people to speak. And how much  
13 time do you need?  
14 MS. JONI ARENDS: I have two paragraphs.  
15 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Okay.  
16 MS. JONI ARENDS: Short paragraphs.  
17 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Okay. Please go  
18 ahead.  
19 MS. JONI ARENDS: Further, as stated in  
20 Appendix F of the draft -- thank you, everyone. Thank  
21 you.  
22 Further, as stated in Appendix F of the  
23 draft LANL SWEIS, contaminants have moved off site and  
24 are contaminating the drinking water wells for Los  
25 Alamos County and the Buckman well field. Over 40

123

1 percent of Santa Fe's drinking water supply is located  
2 at the Buckman well field, directly across the river  
3 from Los Alamos. Appendix F documented that not only  
4 is there plutonium, americium, but there's neptunium,  
5 which is directly a radionuclide from weapons  
6 production, concentrations in Los Alamos County wells  
7 above the EPA drinking water standard.

8 Now, the neptunium is a big deal, that  
9 there's neptunium above the EPA drinking water  
10 standards in the Los Alamos wells. And there's also  
11 strontium 90 levels at 13 times the EPA drinking water

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

12 standard. But there's also evidence of these  
13 radionuclides in the Buckman well field. And you need  
14 to look at Appendix F.

15 This evidence alone indicates that there is  
16 an emerging environmental emergency at LANL, and in  
17 order to protect public health and the environment no  
18 new operations can begin there. There are also many  
19 safety and security issues at LANL that threaten  
20 national security, therefore LANL nuclear weapons  
21 activities must stop, and cleanup must be the  
22 priority.

23 Thank you for your consideration of our  
24 comments.

25 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Okay. Just want to

124

1 do one more check, Wakeland? No. Monica Steinhoff,  
2 please, you will be next. Virginia Miller you will be  
3 second, and Elliot Skinner will be third.

4 MS. MONICA STEINHOFF: My name is Monica  
5 Steinhoff. And I want to thank Joni for her -- I mean  
6 it's amazing to me that people can actually, who are  
7 not paid by Los Alamos Lab and the DOE can do this  
8 much work, and this includes Greg Mello, can do this  
9 much work to understand this whole stuff. To me it's  
10 totally -- it's totally absurd. There's one thing  
11 that -- I can understand a suicide bomber. I mean,  
12 when you deal with this level of absurdity and there  
13 is no recourse -- I mean, you know we have been here  
14 for so many years.

15 I remember in Alamogordo when they talked  
16 about nuclear weapons and they talked about, oh -- and

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

17 I said this many times before, but this audience  
18 understands, and I want to remind them about it, and  
19 it really is. It's like Freud said, you know, and  
20 before it was brought out, you know, it's an extension  
21 of the penis. You know, the people who really love  
22 nuclear weapons, it's the power, you know, but it's  
23 destroying -- we are at the brink of history right  
24 now. All of you.

25           The people who get paid, that they are --

125

1 you know, those of you who work related -- I had to,  
2 you know relinquish my little granddaughter, who I get  
3 to hold not very much at all, to come here. That's  
4 very important to me. And I really think about these  
5 kids, all the people who mentioned their grandchildren  
6 and their grandchildren's grandchildren, the world we  
7 have created is totally absurd. You know, how many  
8 nuclear bombs would it take to kill one suicide  
9 bomber? Because people -- as long as we oppress  
10 people the way we have around the world, there are  
11 going to be suicide bombers and there is nobody to  
12 stop them.

13           So we can have trillions of nuclear bombs.  
14 You know, what's really interesting about all this is  
15 our debt is being carried by China. Why are they  
16 doing this? Think of what we pay for building nuclear  
17 weapons, and admit it and say no debt. Pay your  
18 debt. I think the reason might be we are losing our  
19 power rapidly. It is incredible. We are so in debt.  
20 We have lied our way through so much garbage.

21           The war in Iraq, for example, you know,

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

22 China is saying, I don't have to do anything. I don't  
23 have to build any more nuclear bombs, nothing. They  
24 are diminishing their power every day to such an  
25 effective degree, it's incredible. You know? So what

126

1 are we doing? I think this thing will end. I think  
2 all you people are obsolete, basically. Even though  
3 you are getting your benefits, even though you are  
4 driving a big car and getting a big house. You are  
5 still obsolete. It's not the men.

6           The women of the world are rising up.  
7 There's grass roots power everywhere happening and  
8 this will stop it. This is a sickness, it's  
9 unbelievable. And it's really the aggrandizement of  
10 the ego. I get the Viagra ads all the time on my  
11 computer. Just use Viagra. It's a lot cheaper than  
12 nuclear weapons. Thank you.

13           MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you. Next  
14 speaker is Virginia Miller.

15           MS. VIRGINIA MILLER: Thank you all for  
16 hanging in there. It's been a long evening, all of  
17 you. I am Virginia Miller. I have been -- I have  
18 been working to end the nuclear scrap for decades, and  
19 ever since I moved here -- I'm a resident of Santa Fe  
20 for the past 14 years. It's just been one hearing  
21 after another, one after another, and we are still  
22 doing it. It's time to stop. It's time to end this  
23 madness.

24           Oh, I have this here. This. Shannyn --  
25 Shannyn made these, and I think they're a wonderful

1 symbol for what we need to do. We need to -- well, no  
2 bombplex 2030. No nuclear pit production at LANL. No  
3 nuclear weapons expansion anywhere. No nuclear power,  
4 no nuclear anything. It's dangerous. You don't know  
5 what to do with the waste. It's time to stop it.

6 My original and alternative proposal  
7 embraces complete worldwide nuclear disarmament led by  
8 the United States, and the current proposals before us  
9 are illegal, and you are violating the international  
10 law. A number of people have mentioned this, and I  
11 mentioned it in August, too, when we had the last  
12 hearing, that the nonproliferation treaty, which we  
13 have signed, clearly states that we should be working  
14 for nuclear disarmament. Let's get on with it now.

15 It is now time to create and -- I support  
16 this, and I'm working for a New Mexico Office of Peace  
17 and to promote a culture of peace, not only in the  
18 United States but in our nation and in our world.  
19 That means exploring and implementing a peace economy  
20 in New Mexico. That means the lab scientists cleaning  
21 up, among a lot of other things, cleaning up all  
22 radioactive contamination and not producing any more.  
23 It means helping to implement a sound nuclear  
24 disarmament verification system. It means developing  
25 a renewable energy, an effective global warming

1 solution.

2 Don't do this. The future of New Mexico,  
3 our people, our children, our land, air and water and,  
4 I'm very concerned about water, and Joni just

5 explained why this is so serious, water especially.  
6 We have no stake -- we have no life without water.  
7 All of these things are at stake. And as has been  
8 said, it is stopping. It is beginning to end, and we  
9 are going to make sure it does, because the sooner the  
10 better. Thank you.

11 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Okay. Our next  
12 speaker would be Elliot Skinner, followed by Michael  
13 Brace. And Ms. Hibbs, if you would like to speak, if  
14 we have time.

15 MR. ELLIOTT SKINNER: I want to thank  
16 everyone who has been here, and those survivors,  
17 including the staff who is listening to us.

18 Many of us here have been attending these  
19 hearings from back into the late '70s, including me.  
20 And I can remember those early hearings. We had -- we  
21 have kind of a downsized staff. We used to have four  
22 bureaucrats who would sit at the table, or five. But  
23 nonetheless, even with those five, people are very  
24 nervous. We, as a community are grateful, should be  
25 grateful to DOE because we have learned a lot from

129

1 these hearings.

2 I can remember those early hearings people  
3 would stand up and they would be shaking, literally  
4 shaking. Why? Because from the time they were in  
5 kindergarten they have been told to be quiet, and they  
6 have four or five people wearing suits, no expression,  
7 and it was frightening. But over the years we have  
8 learned that we have a voice, we have learned that we  
9 can speak for five minutes. We have learned that we

10 can learn from one another, and I see these hearings  
11 as mainly a process of, so far, a process of educating  
12 ourselves and supporting ourselves as a community,  
13 less so certainly in terms of affecting the DOE  
14 bureaucratic totalitarian system.

15 We have wonderful groups that have developed  
16 over these years, thanks to LANL, thanks to DOE -- Los  
17 Alamos Study Group, CCNS, Nuclear Watch. And you just  
18 heard an example of what these groups mean to us as  
19 citizens. They have done tremendous work for us,  
20 educating us, working incredibly hard. This is the  
21 other society in our country. It's the society of  
22 nongovernmental organizations. This is a society of  
23 people who devote their time and their talents and  
24 their education to try to stop the madness that is  
25 represented by the Department of Energy. And we are a

130

1 powerful community now.

2 Santa Fe is known in the country as one of  
3 the three or four most progressive communities, and a  
4 lot of this is due to the fact that when we step out  
5 of our houses, when we look out of our windows we see,  
6 over there, lights at night, those lights of Technical  
7 Area 55 that never blink because they are so powerful,  
8 they never go off. They are there every night. They  
9 have been there for decades. And the work is going  
10 on. When I step out of the back of my house and I see  
11 that I feel sick in my stomach. And I think to  
12 myself, what does it mean for our region? I would  
13 like to ask if part of the Environmental Impact Study,  
14 I would like to ask that there be a study of the

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

15 effect of having a death laboratory in this area.  
16           Clarissa spoke beautifully about her people  
17 down below. What is it like to have a neighbor, a  
18 thug, a murderer, somebody who believes that the only  
19 way to get what he or she wants is to threaten  
20 destruction, to threaten harm, to threaten death?  
21 That lives in our community. We now have separate  
22 hearings. There's a hearing this morning, a sort of  
23 self-imposed apartheid for the Los Alamos people up  
24 there. Used to be we would meet in the hearings and  
25 actually some groups of communication, dialogue and

131

1 seminars came out of those. Now I see it has been  
2 separated.

3           We here in Santa Fe are a powerful community  
4 and I would like to follow what Willem Malten said,  
5 that workers for the Laboratory who can no longer take  
6 what they're forced to do and have chosen to do and  
7 are very rewarded, highly paid to do, as the revulsion  
8 builds in them, there is a community here that they  
9 could turn to and we will help. As Willem said, we'll  
10 help try to find opportunities, to develop  
11 opportunities where they can use their talents, and  
12 I mean, I would say. I think the so-called science at  
13 Los Alamos is highly speculative. If the Lab were to  
14 decide to turn, I will get DOE's money to make the  
15 decision. And I think I could tell you, I agree with  
16 Jay Coghlan, I think it's fairly inevitable this whole  
17 process goes through, that the pit production will  
18 continue in Los Alamos.

19           So those people in Los Alamos are going to

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

20 have to say they can see themselves as, quote,  
21 unquote, scientists, they have had the cache, they  
22 have the loose association with the University of  
23 California, it's really pretty low level science. Los  
24 Alamos, for all these decades, hasn't received a  
25 single Nobel prize for any kind of accomplishment. I

132

1 think I see that possibility in the future. They  
2 could start working on environmental restoration.  
3 They could start working on all the things that have  
4 been mentioned, and I could see the possibility that  
5 that prize, which came from, you know, a dynamite  
6 manufacturer, nonetheless, maybe there would be  
7 candidates.

8           It's really not science that's going on up  
9 there. It's kind of basic engineering and, now,  
10 I suspect this morning in the hearing you heard from  
11 people in Los Alamos saying, we don't want it here.  
12 We don't want production here. What do they want?  
13 They want to see themselves as these pure scientists,  
14 kind of making up -- making their products, and then  
15 they say, oh, the politicians decide what to do with  
16 them, and other people somewhere else do the dirty  
17 work of making those -- those pucks, they call them.

18           I saw a picture of them the other day, the  
19 hand in the glovebox with the puck safety glasses.  
20 I'm glad he's concerned about his own safety. Maybe  
21 they can take those pucks and convert this conflict  
22 between Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore into some  
23 kind of massive hockey game somewhere out in the  
24 deserts in Nevada.

25

If there are people up there who see the

133

1 evil of what they're doing and wish to convert it  
2 somehow, you know, people who have wished to convert,  
3 maybe the first opportunity should be to fight against  
4 the DOE and the bureaucracy. Havel, Vladislav and  
5 Havel, which described the Soviet Union as a  
6 bureaucratic totalitarianism. Bureaucratic  
7 totalitarianism, that's what we have in this country.  
8 Ultimately the Constitution has been cited. It always  
9 comes out of one clause in the section of the  
10 executive. The president shall appoint officers to  
11 help carry out his duties. That's a clause, and out  
12 of that has grown this monstrous, monstrous  
13 bureaucracy, with their arrogance. We'll hear you.  
14 We'll write it down. And then the Director will  
15 decide. This is totalitarianism, and this is what we  
16 are faced with now.

17           The employees of Los Alamos might have an  
18 opportunity to fight against this. They have the  
19 chance to have work slowdowns, to have work stoppages,  
20 to have strikes. They can go on strike. They don't  
21 want to be associated with pit production. And I  
22 invite them to consider that possibility, and they  
23 will find support in this community to do it.

24           MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: One minute, please.

25           MR. ELLIOTT SKINNER: Thank you.

134

1           Los Alamos, one of the richest counties in  
2 the entire country, as Clarissa so eloquently spoke  
3 about, is surrounded by poverty, it's surrounded by

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

4 heavy use of heroin, a destruction of family and  
5 traditional communities. And I want to say again,  
6 this should be part of the Environmental Impact  
7 Study. Get whoever you can find, sociologists,  
8 whoever, to correlate.

9           In a hearing about five years ago, it was  
10 made to the top official at the Lab, said, my  
11 suggestion was there may be a connection between the  
12 violence that we have in this area and the existence  
13 of Los Alamos Laboratories. I said, to myself,  
14 bingo. He shouted out -- and when I finished my  
15 remarks -- he came charging up, and outraged that  
16 there would be any kind of suggestion that there could  
17 be a connection between the work done at that  
18 Laboratory and the effect on the culture of the area.  
19 He was outraged. Why? Because of the mentality of  
20 compartmentalization. It's separation. We're up  
21 here, they are down there. We do our job.  
22 Politicians decide what to do with our production, and  
23 so on.

24           There's a whole lab -- Hugh Gusterson did a  
25 book on the culture around the nuclear energy,

135

1 studying Los Alamos and Lawrence Livermore, and right  
2 from the get go, it was compartmentalized. Why?  
3 Because of security. That's deep in the culture, and  
4 it's allowed people up there to say, okay, I'm doing  
5 this and I know these weapons could maybe cause some  
6 harms, but that's none of my business. Well, it is  
7 their business. It is our business.

8           And I'm really grateful to everyone who has

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

9 shown up here this evening. I will continue to show  
10 up. And we're a strong community. We're growing  
11 stronger by the day, and we actually probably are a  
12 much more powerful force than this whole issue, than  
13 what people have said, this kind of obsolete  
14 bureaucratic structure that's rolling along. Thank  
15 you.

16 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Michael Brace.

17 MR. MICHAEL BRACE: I am against the war,  
18 and I don't want to see mass destruction. Thank you.

19 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you. Linda  
20 Hibbs?

21 MS. LINDA HIBBS: Thank you. I came from a  
22 meeting tonight of political communities that have  
23 been together for 16 years, and the form of that  
24 meeting and the reason I think we're so strong -- we  
25 came together to resist the first Gulf War -- is

136

1 because we always have a form where we make sure that  
2 there is both a chance for everyone in the room to  
3 speak and to listen.

4 And I am really just struck by that now  
5 because I feel that though there has been very good  
6 listening on the part of the gentleman and the lady  
7 taking notes, I really feel that the circumstance is  
8 deeply flawed, because we really haven't had a chance  
9 to hear from them. And of course, I'm not going to  
10 ask you to speak, but I just want to say that that's  
11 the model, that dialogue is the model. And that's how  
12 we have been able to progress in this community across  
13 the lines of our -- we have many overlapping circles

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

14 in our community that are progressive.

15 I think there was a feeling I had when I was  
16 anticipating this meeting tonight -- and I was feeling  
17 grumpy about it because, again, it's been a 25-year  
18 stretch.

19 There is an image that Kafka has of a hare,  
20 rabbit who is hanging out over an abyss and he has his  
21 forearms holding onto the side of this rim, and his  
22 legs are dangling down in the abyss and he can't get  
23 them on the ground. And I think that image for me  
24 captures the frustration that I felt at these hearings  
25 over the last quarter century. And of course I'm

137

1 against the bombplex for the reasons -- and I could  
2 give my mantra, to be very similar to what others have  
3 said tonight, but I feel that the frustration is  
4 that -- I just lost my way. It's so late.

5 I know the rabbit -- the rabbit down --  
6 Hum -- I will have it in a moment.  
7 25 years of frustration, this is what comes  
8 to this.

9 That's what -- maybe the silence is the best  
10 part. All right. Now -- but that is -- well, perhaps  
11 I will not come up with it.

12 But there's another model for how life is  
13 happening right now, and it's marvelous. I think that  
14 so many of us are aware. That's including, I think,  
15 the people at the podium. And so I think that -- that  
16 the tide has shifted, and so there is a sense that  
17 there is a way in which -- it's very difficult to be  
18 in this country right now, there's so much energy

12-06-2006 1947 Wednesday

19 that's happening today. On Amy Goodman, she said  
20 there were 80 universities starting up in Venezuela.  
21 All that money from billions of dollars from the oil  
22 is being poured into social services. And so there is  
23 a great change, and I feel that we can avail ourselves  
24 of that resource, and certainly this project here will  
25 come to an end.

138

1 And I thank everyone who has been here  
2 tonight, because we really are, we're all in love,  
3 that's what it is, we're all in love and that extends  
4 even to those who are on the other side. My husband  
5 and I did a seminar with Los Alamos scientists for  
6 four years and, we built very strong bonds with those  
7 people, and they still exist. Thank you.

8 MODERATOR BARRY LAWSON: Thank you.

9 Well, I want to thank you all and I do feel  
10 that I owe you an explanation for the way the rules  
11 were set up. I know when you have a group of people  
12 and they are all like-minded, it seems like you can  
13 perhaps establish some new rules. I am given a list  
14 of people. I don't know whether the people are on one  
15 side or the other. And when we advertise we are going  
16 to spend five minutes, it's my obligation to try to  
17 keep to that. And in fact, in my ground rules I said  
18 that anybody who wanted to speak for more than five  
19 minutes, they would just tell me ahead of time I will  
20 make sure that they can come back at the end of the  
21 meeting and fulfill that. And we have people, as far  
22 as I know, who are ready to go, assuming they are  
23 going to be over in five minutes. That's the reason I

24 stick so highly to those rules.

25 I want to thank you all for coming to the

139

1 meeting. I know it has been a long evening, but I  
2 have been -- I have been at five meetings this week  
3 and I have to say, I have been terribly impressed with  
4 the sincerity and the passion of the comments that  
5 have been made by people at all these sessions.

6 Thank you for coming, especially learning  
7 about the project, the time that you have taken to  
8 produce comments. I want to remind you that even  
9 though you made comments tonight, there is still  
10 plenty of time, the next month -- actually, five  
11 weeks, I guess, to be able to send other comments,  
12 either by E-mail or fax, or probably another way.  
13 There's some forms outside if you want to use them to  
14 send the material in.

15 I would be remiss if I didn't thank our  
16 court reporter, Mabel Chin. Mabel also worked this  
17 morning in the Los Alamos, so she probably has a  
18 little weariness settling in on her now.

19 Anyway, I want to thank you all again, and I  
20 really appreciate your coming. And this meeting is  
21 now adjourned.

22 (The meeting adjourned at 11:45 p.m.)

23  
24  
25

140

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO )  
2 COUNTY OF SANTA FE ) ss

3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, MABEL JIN CHIN, New Mexico Certified Court Reporter, do hereby certify that I did report in stenographic shorthand the proceedings set forth herein, and the foregoing is a true and correct transcription of the proceedings.

I further certify that I am neither employed by nor related to any of the parties or attorneys in this case, and that I have no interest whatsoever in the final disposition of this case in any court.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mabel Jin Chin, CCR  
Certified Court Reporter #81  
License Expires: 12/31/2006

(2499A)MC