

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

+ + + + +

PUBLIC SCOPING SESSION NUMBER 17

IN RE: COMPLEX 2030

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,

DECEMBER 14, 2006

+ + + + +

The public comment meeting was held in room 1E-245 of the Forrestal building at 1000 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. at 2:00 p.m., TED WYKA, presiding official, presiding.

PRESENT:

TED WYKA	Presiding Official
HOLMES BROWN	Facilitator

COMMENTERS:

MICHELE BOYD	Public Citizen's Energy Program
FATHER JOHN CHRYSAVGIS	Greek Orthodox Church
DAVID CULP	Friends Committee on National Legislation
JODI DART	Alliance for Nuclear Accountability
LAWRENCE EGBERT	Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations
ALAN GAMBLE	
SUSAN R. GORDON	Alliance for Nuclear Accountability
MARK GUBRUD	
KEVIN KAMPS	Nuclear Information and Resource Service

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

COMMENTERS (Continued):

MARY DAY KENT	Women's International League for Peace and Freedom
SISTER MARIE LUCEY	Leadership Conference of Women Religious
ARJUN MAKHIJANI	IEER
ROBIN MILLS	
PAMELA MOFFAT	
THE REVEREND JOSEPH NANGLE	Pax Christi U.S.A.
ARTHUR NELSON	
DENNIS NELSON	
ROBERT NELSON	Union of Concerned Scientists
BISHOP JOHN SCHOL	United Methodist Church
ELLEN THOMAS	Proposition One Committee and Washington Peace Center
STEPHEN YOUNG	

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

I-N-D-E-X

COMMENTER	PAGE
BISHOP JOHN SCHOL	5
ELLEN THOMAS	7
ROBIN MILLS	10
DENNIS NELSON	12
SUSAN R. GORDON	15
SISTER MARIE LUCEY	22
DAVID CULP	25
PAMELA MOFFAT	28
MARY DAY KENT	30
FATHER JOHN CHRYSAVGIS	33
JODI DART	37
LAWRENCE EGBERT	43
MARK GUBRUD	47
ALAN GAMBLE	51
ROBERT NELSON	56
MICHELE BOYD	60
STEPHEN YOUNG	66
DENNIS NELSON	67
MARK GUBRUD	68
THE REVEREND JOSEPH NANGLE	73
KEVIN KAMPS	78
ARJUN MAKHIJANI	83
ARTHUR NELSON	94
ARJUN MAKHIJANI	95
KEVIN KAMPS	101
ARJUN MAKHIJANI	102

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 (2:33 p.m.)

3 FACILITATOR BROWN: It is now time to
4 receive your formal comments on the scope of the
5 proposed environmental impact statement. This is
6 your opportunity to let DOE know what you would like
7 to see addressed in the draft document.

8 A court reporter is available to
9 transcribe your statement. And if you have not yet
10 signed up to speak and would like to do so, please
11 you can add your name to the list over there. And we
12 will call your name.

13 Let me review a few ground rules for the
14 comments. Please step up to the microphone over
15 there when your name is called, introduce yourself
16 providing an organizational affiliation where
17 appropriate.

18 If you have a written version of your
19 statement, please provide a copy to the court
20 reporter after you have completed your remarks. And
21 also if you have any sort of attachments or extended
22 remarks that you would like to see be part of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 record but won't be actually reading from today you
2 can add those to your statement. And those will be
3 added.

4 I will call two names at a time, the
5 first of the speaker and the second of the person to
6 follow. In view of the number of folks who have
7 indicated an interest in speaking today, please
8 confine your public remarks to five minutes. You're
9 certainly free, then, to submit the remainder of the
10 statement for the record in printing. And I will let
11 you know when you have a minute remaining.

12 So, with that by way of introduction, we
13 will get started. In our other public meetings, we
14 have allowed elected officials to go first. We don't
15 have any elected officials here this afternoon, but
16 we did have one request from a person who had a time
17 constraint, whom I am going to get go first. And
18 that is Bishop John Schol. And while not an elected
19 official, we hope that he is among the elect.

20 (Laughter.)

21 FACILITATOR BROWN: My twin brother is a
22 minister. So I hope you enjoyed that line.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Bishop, you're welcome.

2 BISHOP SCHOL: Thank you very much. And
3 I pray, too, I am part of the elect. So thank you.
4 I appreciate that very much.

5 Good afternoon. No one, no one wants
6 nuclear war again. No one ever wants to see nuclear
7 weapons used again. No one wants nuclear war.

8 In 1986, the Council of Bishops of the
9 United Methodist Church issued a pastoral letter
10 entitled "In Defense of Creation," in which we said
11 no, a clear unconditioned no to nuclear war or to the
12 use of nuclear weapons. I do not believe anyone here
13 would disagree with us.

14 One of the questions before you, I
15 believe, is whether Complex 2030, the proposal to
16 renew, concentrate, and enhance our nation's nuclear
17 weapons system, will make the use of nuclear weapons
18 more or less likely.

19 The question is whether heightening and
20 concentrating our nation's nuclear arsenal will cause
21 a reduction in nuclear weapons throughout the world
22 or result in other nations feeling compelled to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 develop or expand their nuclear capacity.

2 It is basic truth that no one can with
3 integrity preach one thing and practice something
4 different. If the United States is to advocate the
5 reduction of nuclear weaponry by other nations, we
6 must lead by example and not only reduce our
7 stockpile but also not to build Complex 2030, which
8 will build new nuclear warheads.

9 We believe that the United States must
10 lead the world to eliminate nuclear weapons, not in
11 building new ones. We cannot urge the nations not to
12 build nuclear weapons but then produce and spend \$150
13 billion on our nuclear weapons complex.

14 We believe that bishop -- excuse me. We
15 believe that President Bush -- we don't want to make
16 him a bishop today.

17 (Laughter.)

18 BISHOP SCHOL: We believe that President
19 Bush's 2004 directive that the size of the U.S.
20 nuclear weapons stockpile be reduced by nearly 50
21 percent by 2012 represents a better vision for our
22 nation's future. This is the kind of future our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 nation and our world should be envisioning, one in
2 which nuclear weaponry is reduced and eventually
3 banned.

4 Recent studies indicate Complex 2030 is
5 not needed to achieve President Bush's directive.
6 Our government should join other nations to
7 reinvigorate nuclear non-proliferation treaties
8 signed by 180 non-nuclear countries who promise to
9 forego nuclear weapons provided nuclear powers
10 abolish theirs. And we believe the billions proposed
11 to spend on Complex 2030 should be reallocated for
12 effective programs to overcome poverty here in the
13 United States and abroad.

14 The prophet Isaiah spoke on behalf of the
15 people of God and also God, "Woe for those who rely
16 on horses who trust in chariots because they are many
17 and in horsemen because they are very strong but do
18 not look to the holy one of Israel or consult the
19 Lord."

20 May we not make the mistake of supposing
21 that peace in our world will ultimately be achieved
22 by fear and nuclear capacity. It will come as the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fruit of justice, equality, and compassion.

2 Please choose life in your decisions.

3 Thank you very much.

4 (Applause.)

5 FACILITATOR BROWN: You came within ten
6 seconds of the limit. You clearly have given many a
7 sermon.

8 (Laughter.)

9 FACILITATOR BROWN: So thank you.

10 Our next speaker is Ellen Thomas. And
11 she will be followed by Robin Mills.

12 MS. THOMAS: Good afternoon. I am Ellen
13 Thomas with Proposition One Committee and the
14 Washington Peace Center.

15 Whatever the motives of the Department of
16 Energy or the White House, consolidating nuclear
17 facilities can only be useful if coupled with a
18 program which leads to global elimination of nuclear
19 weapons.

20 There is legislation in the U.S. Congress
21 which will soon be reintroduced for the eighth time
22 entitled "The Nuclear Disarmament and Economic

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Conversion Act." This, in essence, would be a
2 promise to the rest of the world that the U.S. will
3 eliminate all its nuclear weapons if everyone else
4 does and use the money saved to shut down and clean
5 up the nuclear weapons facilities and begin
6 conversion of other arms industries to provide for
7 human needs, such as truly clean, non-radioactive
8 energy systems, solar panels, windmills, geothermal
9 taps, instead of missiles, bombs, and depleted
10 uranium munitions.

11 The U.S. has been number one in using and
12 spreading dangerous nuclear technology. Complex 2030
13 is more of the same. It's appalling to see on page 3
14 of today's handout the intention to "maintain a
15 capability to design, develop, and produce new or
16 adapted warheads when there are so many warheads
17 still deployed, so many plutonium pits in storage."

18 We should not be ensuring "an
19 economically sustainable nuclear weapons enterprise."

20 We should be ensuring the total elimination of
21 nuclear weapons as promised by our country decades
22 ago in the nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Department of Energy officials argue that
2 Complex 2030 is designed to implement policies set by
3 the President and that changing those policies is a
4 political problem. I hope that the report on these
5 hearings will include comments such as mine that no
6 nuclear weapons is the absolutely necessary goal so
7 politicians understand our concerns.

8 I am including with this comment the text
9 of the bill in Congress mentioned earlier plus a
10 petition on which we have collected well over 100,000
11 signatures supporting that legislation plus a comment
12 sheet from Nuclear Watch South in Atlanta, which
13 says, in part, "The world doesn't need one more atom
14 bomb. Disarm now. Honor our treaty obligations.
15 It's time to kick the bomb habit and switch to 100
16 percent protecting the environment from DOE's deadly
17 nuclear waste inventory and stockpiles of
18 weapons-grade materials."

19 Thank you.

20 FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you.

21 (Applause.)

22 FACILITATOR BROWN: Robin Mills? And

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Dennis Nelson will follow.

2 MR. MILLS: I am Robin Mills. I am a
3 member of the Washington Peace Center of Washington,
4 D.C.; a member of the Peace Farm of Amarillo, Texas;
5 and a member of Ground Zero Center for Nonviolent
6 Change in Washington State.

7 I am totally opposed to options one, two,
8 and three in the proposed action and would like to
9 suggest that there should be a proposal number four.

10 My reasons for that are that it seems to me that,
11 even in proposal three, there is significant cost.
12 And in order to compare the proposed actions with a
13 no-action alternative, the no-action alternative
14 should be no nuclear weapons production capability at
15 all.

16 I believe this is required legally by our
17 agreement in the signature of the nuclear
18 nonproliferation treaty. I believe this is required
19 by law in our signature on the Geneva Conventions and
20 the Nuremberg Accord. I believe this is morally
21 required by us as seen by the Methodist Encyclical on
22 Peace and the Catholic bishops' agreement that I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 worked with back at the Peace Farm.

2 I believe that this is required by law
3 back from the law that was passed during the Reagan
4 administration requiring a cost-benefit analysis.
5 How can we do a cost-benefit analysis if we are not
6 starting from ground zero, which would be no nuclear
7 weapons capability at all? How can we compare these
8 various alternatives unless we know what the zero is?

9 And, finally, I would like to say that
10 recently the JASON report reported that the plutonium
11 in these nuclear weapons should last 80 to 100 years.

12 The problem is the helium build-up inside due to
13 plutonium decay, potentially causing bulges in the
14 plutonium weapons.

15 While the JASON report seems to indicate
16 that this build-up of helium inside the plutonium
17 does not become a problem for a much longer period of
18 time than we had previously been led to believe, if
19 this is the case, then our current nuclear weapons
20 are just fine for another 50 to 100 years, perhaps
21 longer, and there is no need to have a pit-making
22 capability.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Therefore, I would like to ask, please,
2 that a fourth alternative be added. It says that
3 we're going to change the way our nation handles
4 nuclear weapons and that public officials are going
5 to consider all proposed actions and alternatives.

6 I would like to ask, please, that an
7 alternative be included that would include no
8 bomb-making capability, no pit-making capability that
9 goes well beyond alternative three.

10 Thank you very much.

11 (Applause.)

12 FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. Dennis Nelson?
13 And Susan Gordon will follow.

14 MR. D. NELSON: My name is Dennis Nelson.
15 I am a Utah downwinder. I lived in St. George, Utah
16 during the '50s and early '60s, when the above-ground
17 tests took place at the Nevada test site.

18 Particularly in the Spring of 1953, there
19 were levels of contamination from the Nevada test
20 site on the streets of my hometown that exceeded
21 those that were seen in Prypiat after the explosion
22 at Chernobyl, which caused the Russian government to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 evacuate the entire population of 50,000 people.

2 And, yet, the U.S. government told our
3 people to stay put, stay inside for two hours. And,
4 yet, the information that we received was delayed.
5 And so that it was too late by the time we received
6 the information. So that's the difference in the
7 culture.

8 I realize the culture has changed and
9 things are different. I also realize that there were
10 tragedies that happened because of the earlier lack
11 of concern, lack of environmental concern and human
12 concern.

13 My personal experience, my mother died at
14 age 47 of a brain tumor. My sister died at age 40 of
15 colon cancer. My father died at age 62 of lung and
16 bone cancer. I myself have had cancer. My brother
17 had lymphoma and survived. We have had 7 different
18 kinds of cancer and probably close to 80 years of
19 lost life because of this, I believe, impossible
20 search for national security.

21 Nuclear weapons do not produce security,
22 particularly in this day and age, when we have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 suicide bombers, who don't care about themselves.
2 What does a deterrent mean if a person is willing to
3 kill himself in order to kill you? Deterrent is
4 meaningless.

5 So nuclear weapons have lost their value.

6 And the only possible reason that I can see for
7 doing this or for the DOE to do this project is so
8 that they can get around the congressional
9 prescriptions on mini-nukes and bunker busters and
10 those sorts of things.

11 So I am very, very concerned that we
12 revive a whole new episode of this tragedy that cost
13 four to five trillion dollars originally. And it
14 will probably cost in the neighborhood of another
15 trillion dollars. It just doesn't make any sense
16 whatsoever to pursue this ridiculous and I consider
17 stupid goal to try to create national security
18 through nuclear weapons. It just won't work. In
19 fact, it will kill more of us.

20 (Applause.)

21 FACILITATOR BROWN: Susan Gordon? And
22 Sister Marie Lucey will be next.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. GORDON: Good afternoon. My name is
2 Susan Gordon. And I am the Director of the Alliance
3 for Nuclear Accountability. We are a national
4 network of 35 organizations that work collaboratively
5 on issues of nuclear weapons production and waste
6 cleanup.

7 Most of our member groups live in
8 communities directly downwind and downstream from the
9 Department of Energy's nuclear weapons complex sites.
10 They know firsthand the environmental and health
11 consequences of U.S. nuclear weapons production.

12 For nearly 20 years, ANA groups have been
13 the watchdogs at the DOE sites, working to ensure
14 that the federal government cleans up the hazardous
15 and radioactive contamination that was left from the
16 first nuclear arms race.

17 Now the American public is faced with the
18 prospect of a second arms race, Complex 2030 is a
19 bizarrely inappropriate Dr. Strangelove-esque plan to
20 build the nuclear weapons complex in order to
21 manufacture the reliable replacement warheads.

22 ANA has coined the term the "bombplex,"

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 which I am sure you have heard quite a bit in the
2 last couple of weeks at the hearings. This plan,
3 which is supposed to make our nuclear weapons
4 stockpile more reliable, shrink the size of the
5 complex, and produce new nuclear weapons with new
6 military missions, comes packaged with three
7 proposals, as was earlier outlined. All of those
8 call for new production facilities and production of
9 plutonium pits.

10 NNSA has failed to consider a fourth
11 option. That option is a constitutional alternative
12 based on Article VI of the U.S. Constitution that
13 says "Treaties are among the things that are the
14 supreme law of the land." Fully implementing article
15 6 of the nonproliferation treaty, therefore, must be
16 a reasonable alternative to comply with the
17 constitutional requirement.

18 In case you have forgotten what article 6
19 of the NPT says, it calls for the nuclear powers to
20 work for the elimination of their nuclear weapons.
21 Complex 2030 clearly does not move the U.S. towards
22 disarmament, despite plans to dismantle a few more

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 warheads. We specifically ask that NNSA provide an
2 analysis for this fourth option of disarmament and
3 elimination of nuclear weapons.

4 With the release of the plutonium pit
5 study or pit lifetime study, a key justification has
6 been pulled for the reliable replacement warhead
7 program that is the centerpiece of the bombplex plan.

8 Uncertainty in the current stockpile has
9 centered on plutonium pits. The study by the JASON
10 panel shows that the plutonium pits are stable for at
11 least 100 years and possibly longer.

12 Immediately after the JASON report was
13 released, NNSA issued a press release stating that
14 they had determined that the RRW was feasible as a
15 strategy for sustaining the nation's nuclear weapons
16 stockpile for the long term without underground
17 nuclear testing. They came to this decision after
18 reviewing competing designs for replacement nuclear
19 warheads submitted by Los Alamos and Lawrence
20 Livermore National Labs.

21 And just yesterday, George Allen said
22 that the complex must be transformed, whether or not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they actually are able to build the RRW. So in our
2 perspective, the rationalization of the bombplex will
3 continue to be a moving target as each aspect of the
4 plan comes to light. The goal of the bombplex is to
5 return to producing new nuclear weapons at the same
6 level as during the cold war.

7 In his testimony before the House Armed
8 Services Committee in April of this year, NNSA Deputy
9 Defense Director Thomas D'Agostino said, and I quote,
10 "We seek the ability to design, develop, certify, and
11 begin production of refurbished or replacement
12 warheads within 48 months of a decision to begin
13 engineering development. These time lines would
14 restore us to a level of capability comparable to
15 what we had during the cold war."

16 The U.S. does not need expensive new
17 nuclear weapons designs and industrial scale bomb
18 production, especially as the existing stockpile
19 stewardship program, which has cost billions of
20 dollars and has certified that the stockpile is safe
21 and reliable each year since 1996.

22 ANA supports a curatorship that maintains

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the current stockpile through surveillance,
2 non-nuclear testing, and repair. Such an approach
3 would accomplish the major stated goals of Complex
4 2030; in short, safety and reliability of the
5 stockpile, consisting of previously tested designs,
6 no return to testing, increased dismantlement,
7 removal of dangerous vulnerable nuclear materials
8 from many sites, and economic programmatic
9 efficiency, all while we move towards meeting our
10 nation's constitutional obligations to eliminate
11 nuclear weapons.

12 We ask that the NNSA provide a life cycle
13 budget for the bombplex that includes construction,
14 operation, decommissioning, and cleanup of the
15 complex. This budget must also incorporate the cost
16 of disposal of hazardous and radioactive materials.

17 Current estimates for the bombplex are
18 150 billion. And that's for the transformation. It
19 does not include the actual costs of cleanup nor the
20 yearly operation budget for which for fiscal year
21 2007 is 6.4 billion.

22 FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. You've got

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just about a minute left or so.

2 MS. GORDON: One minute. Great.

3 As I mentioned earlier, the ANA groups
4 live next door to the DOE sites. Over the past two
5 decades, we as citizen experts have been involved in
6 hundreds of meetings, hearings, and public processes
7 to force the federal government to clean up the
8 radioactive contamination left by the industry. We
9 have analyzed and provided comments on thousands of
10 documents and served on community advisory boards,
11 health subcommittees, community reuse organizations,
12 worked with the National Institutes of Health, and
13 the list goes on and on. And most recently we have
14 organized hundreds of people to turn out at the
15 bombplex hearings and thousands more to submit
16 comments.

17 We will not allow the bombplex to move
18 forward without the American public debating the role
19 of nuclear weapons in our foreign policy. Our
20 current policy of trying to prevent Iran and North
21 Korea from developing nuclear weapons while at the
22 same time ignoring our international treaty

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 obligations has proven to be a failure.

2 The U.S. should reclaim its leadership
3 role and integrity by making disarmament a
4 cornerstone of our foreign policy, increasing our
5 national security and safety, and increasing
6 international security and stability.

7 We ask for an analysis of the role of
8 nuclear weapons and U.S. security, including the
9 environmental and health consequences of using any
10 new nuclear weapons produced through Complex 2030.

11 Anything short of what we are asking for
12 is inadequate under the NEPA Act and inappropriate in
13 the face of the attack on the nonproliferation regime
14 that the bombplex threatens as communities in the
15 shadows of the past, current, and future bombplex
16 failure to fully analyze the issues we have raised
17 and have been raised by others at previous hearings
18 is a disservice to the American people and is not in
19 keeping with the constitutional foundation of our
20 democracy.

21 Thank you.

22 FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (Applause.)

2 FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. Sister Marie
3 Lucey? And David Culp will be next. Thanks.

4 SR. LUCEY: I am Sister Mary Lucey
5 offering testimony on behalf of the Leadership
6 Conference of Women Religious, a national
7 organization of elected leaders of U.S. congregations
8 of women religious, representing approximately 69,000
9 Catholic sisters.

10 The Leadership Conference of Women
11 Religious has a long history of opposing the
12 research, development, testing, and use of nuclear
13 weapons and the diversion of funds from human
14 services and needs to the build-up of armaments.

15 The last assembly resolution -- we have
16 had a series of them, but the latest, in 2004, in
17 which we spoke against the development of new nuclear
18 weapons, which we believe will make the U.S. and the
19 world less, not more, secure.

20 The strong support of Catholic sisters
21 for nuclear disarmament is rooted in our faith in
22 both the scriptures and the social teachings of our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 church. I will eliminate some of the references I
2 have here, but I believe that the U.S. Bishops Peace
3 Pastoral of 1983 is still very relevant. The whole
4 world must summon the moral courage and technical
5 means to say no to nuclear conflict, no to weapons of
6 mass destruction, no to an arms race which robs the
7 poor and the vulnerable.

8 And in his January 1st, 2006 world peace,
9 Day of World Peace, message, Pope Benedict XVI
10 clearly ties nuclear disarmament to resources for
11 human needs and concludes, "How can there ever be a
12 future of peace when investments are still made in
13 the production of arms and in research aimed at
14 developing new ones?"

15 While we desire and work for the
16 elimination of all nuclear weapons from the face of
17 the Earth, in our specific opposition to Complex
18 2030, we are convinced that plutonium and most
19 nuclear weapons will remain reliable for at least a
20 century, that the number of surplus plutonium pits is
21 actually increasing, and that 4,000 more heads in the
22 U.S. current stockpile all provide evidence that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there is no need to produce additional pits.

2 Many of our members work with people who
3 are in dire need of human services and view the
4 expenditure of billions of dollars to build a new
5 nuclear weapons complex as not only wasteful and
6 unnecessary but morally unacceptable.

7 We do not believe that the way to achieve
8 zero nuclear weapons is to increase capacity. And we
9 urge the DOE not to spend human and financial
10 resources to modernize or transform or upgrade U.S.
11 nuclear weapons but to work to ensure U.S. compliance
12 with existing treaties to begin to de-nuclearize our
13 U.S. arsenals and to take the lead, for our country
14 to take the lead, in moving towards a nuclear free
15 world.

16 Thank you.

17 FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 FACILITATOR BROWN: David Culp? And
20 Pamela Moffat will be next.

21 MR. CULP: My name is David Culp. I am a
22 lobbyist for the Friends Committee on National

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Legislation, a Quaker lobby here in Washington, D.C.

2 And earlier this afternoon we submitted a joint
3 statement from 23 national religious organizations
4 opposing the new nuclear weapons complex. We are one
5 of those. Many of the earlier speakers also were
6 signers.

7 I had a great statement, and I am going
8 to change my remarks and address them, instead, to
9 the Energy Department officials. Much of what I have
10 to say has been said by earlier speakers.

11 I have been working on these issues now
12 for 18 years and helped get the nuclear testing
13 moratorium through Congress in 1992, over the very
14 strong objections of the people in this building;
15 helped defeat the nuclear bunker buster, worked on
16 that for 3 years, again, over the very strong
17 objections of the people in this building.

18 And I look around. And I see some
19 departmental employees that had been working on this
20 for quite a few years. I also look back in this
21 room. A lot of events have been in there, some good,
22 some not so good: retirement parties; swearing-ins;

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 holiday receptions; budget briefings; public
2 hearings, like today.

3 But I will just tell you that some of the
4 smartest people in this town work in this building.
5 And it is a great frustration to me to see you come
6 back again on another failed proposal.

7 I mean, you have come to Congress a
8 number of times before asking for new nuclear weapons
9 complexes. You lost every one of those fights.
10 You've tried to get testing resumed. You have lost
11 that fight. You have tried to get funding for
12 development of new nuclear weapons. You have lost
13 that fight.

14 There is more opposition on this program
15 today than almost anything else I have seen in the
16 last decade. I mean, just take a look at the people
17 in the audience. Take a look at the people that
18 signed up today. Take a look at the people that
19 signed just this one statement. These are all
20 national organizations.

21 So I would ask the Department, really, to
22 go back to the drawing board. We all agree that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 national security is important. Everybody in this
2 room agrees on that point. But what you're doing
3 just does not have public support. It doesn't have
4 support on Capitol Hill. Let's go back and come up
5 with a program that has a broader base of support
6 that really addresses the national security needs of
7 this country.

8 Beef up some of your nonproliferation
9 programs. You've got great programs in this
10 building. I worked very hard to try and increase
11 those budgets. But you're not going to get this \$150
12 billion program through Congress. And I wish you
13 would go back to the drawing board and come up with
14 something all of us can support.

15 Thanks for your time.

16 FACILITATOR BROWN: And you'll submit
17 your other statement?

18 MR. CULP: We already did.

19 FACILITATOR BROWN: Oh, you did? Okay.
20 Great. Thanks. Okay.

21 (Applause.)

22 FACILITATOR BROWN: Pamela Moffat,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 welcome. Mary Day Kent is next.

2 MS. MOFFAT: I am not a veteran of this
3 activity. This is a first for me. My name is Pamela
4 Moffat. I'm a wife, mother, grandmother, and member
5 of the Washington Episcopal Diocese's Commission on
6 Peace. My words, however, are not connected to any
7 organization. They are my own.

8 Although not used for much sport or much
9 utility, the SUV has gradually become the Washington
10 town car. It is marketed as the safest car for
11 mothers with car seats. You can control the road
12 when you see all the threats.

13 I guess our country's annual return visit
14 to the nuclear weapons part of the arms bazaar comes
15 from a similar longing that bigger and stronger
16 weapons will give us complete security, we'll be able
17 to relax and enjoy life as we discern.

18 But a savvy public did not agree that the
19 U.S. needed robust nuclear earth penetrators, nor
20 last year's new model, reliable replacement warheads,
21 the very fact that these public hearings have been
22 well-attended, is proof that the public is not easily

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 convinced.

2 President Eisenhower warned about the
3 military-industrial complex. Is it the real driving
4 force behind Complex 2030? We can only build a truly
5 healthy national defense system through partnerships
6 that recognized the shared needs of all countries on
7 the planet, not through proposals based solely on our
8 own short-sighted and short-term employment and
9 export needs.

10 Let's work to find responsible ways to a
11 secure future, starting by reducing, not expanding,
12 the cold war stores of nuclear weapons. This should
13 be done without further tinkering, with treaties, or
14 by ignoring those which might thwart our nuclear
15 ambitions.

16 I cast a no vote on the Complex 2030
17 because I want community, not chaos. Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 FACILITATOR BROWN: Mary Day Kent?
20 Nathan Hodge will be next.

21 MS. DAY KENT: I am Mary Day Kent,
22 Executive Director of the U.S. Section of the Women's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 International League for Peace and Freedom. WILPF
2 has been working for an end to war as an instrument
3 of foreign policy since 1915 and for abolition of
4 nuclear weapons since their first use in 1945. This
5 is our introductory statement. We will be sending
6 some additional detailed commentary by the 17th of
7 January.

8 We must say that we are convinced that
9 the entire Complex 2030 plan, of which these
10 proposals are details, envisions programs that are
11 illegal under both international law and our own
12 Constitution.

13 This is a time in history when the United
14 States should be leading the world's nations toward
15 the abolition of nuclear weapons, as promised in the
16 nuclear nonproliferation treaty, which our nation
17 ratified in 1970.

18 Under our Constitution, that treaty is
19 now part of the supreme law of the land and must be
20 observed not only by the federal government but by
21 every state government and local authority in the
22 nation. Instead, Complex 2030 is calling on the U.S.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Congress and the States of California, Nevada, New
2 Mexico, Texas, South Carolina, and Tennessee to defy;
3 indeed, destroy, the NPT treaty, which has served the
4 world so well since 1970.

5 We believe that the only viable nuclear
6 weapons program is step-by-step dismantlement of
7 nuclear weapons programs worldwide followed by
8 abolition under strict United Nations inspections,
9 control, and enforcement.

10 In these DOE proposals, the writers speak
11 frequently of the proposed program as contributing to
12 a modernized nuclear deterrent. However, we know
13 from other Pentagon, DOE, and NNSA documents that new
14 strategic military plans also call for actual use of
15 nuclear weapons.

16 There has been talk of plans for actual
17 use in the near future in a possible preemptive war
18 against Iran. We know that the bunker buster was
19 being developed and possibly is still being
20 developed, despite the failure of Congress to
21 appropriate funds for this unwise and dangerous
22 program for such use in the near term.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Documents like the doctrine for joint
2 nuclear operations, March 2005, lay out the strategy
3 for fighting nuclear war. And nuclear warfare is an
4 implicit expectation of the missile defense program.

5 We are asked in this process also to
6 assess the possible endangerment of Native Americans
7 and other indigenous people. We point to the
8 continued resistance of the Shoshone and Navajo
9 peoples to all aspects of the nuclear program. These
10 are the U.S. tribes already most seriously harmed by
11 past nuclear weapons programs and who will suffer
12 most from these planned new programs, even if none of
13 the nuclear weapons are ever actually used.

14 We point to the terrible effects on them
15 and on their people of uranium mining in the past and
16 by increased uranium mining necessary to carry this
17 program forward.

18 We refer you to the Shundahai Network of
19 the Shoshone people and the Southwest Research and
20 Information Center of the Navajo people. We also
21 refer you to the declaration against uranium mining
22 of the Shoshone and Navajo peoples and of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 representatives of indigenous peoples threatened by
2 uranium mining in Australia, Japan, China, Brazil,
3 Vanuatu, Germany, India, and the United States.

4 Please read the declaration at their Web
5 site. It is time to listen to these peoples who
6 still live close to the Earth and to take heed for
7 their sakes and for our own.

8 We appreciate the NEPA process, which is
9 important to the functioning of democracy, which we
10 treasure. Thank you for accepting our statement in
11 the spirit in which it was given, which is one of
12 respect for all persons involved in this process, and
13 hope for the future our planet and humanity.

14 FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you.

15 (Applause.)

16 FACILITATOR BROWN: I inadvertently
17 called a name who will not be speaking. So our next
18 speaker will be Fred Booth if Fred is here. Okay.
19 Father John Chryssavgis is next. Sorry we didn't
20 give you more notice. He will be followed by Jodi
21 Dart.

22 FR. CHRYSsavGIS: My name is John

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Chryssavgis. I represent the Greek Orthodox Church
2 here and more so in support of the work of the
3 National Religious Partnership on Nuclear Weapons
4 Danger. And my church has also signed the public
5 comments that have been submitted today.

6 I have modified my statement somewhat.
7 And I'll submit it in writing in light of the
8 previous religious speakers and also for the sake of
9 those who heard them this morning.

10 Look, NNSA, PEIS, CPC, SNN, SSN, NEPA,
11 R&D. It's become really clear to me this afternoon
12 that I speak a different language from the DOE.

13 (Laughter.)

14 FR. CHRYSSAVGIS: And it is a language
15 that is invited and I hope will be heard. So I will
16 speak. And I am hoping that I am speaking the
17 language of the heart.

18 Why is increasing nuclear armament still
19 even being uncritically considered as a viable
20 option? One, the sheer costs are exorbitant: human,
21 financial, environmental, moral.

22 On a level playing field, politics

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 excluded, if taxpayers continue subsidizing weapons
2 development; nuclear waste disposal; insurance
3 against accidents, human and ecological; and the
4 decommissioning of all the facilities, then the
5 financial expense alone of nuclear arms removes them
6 from contention.

7 Second, more significantly, not only is
8 nuclear weaponry arms-sustainable. It's primarily
9 destabilizing. The increasing danger of
10 international terrorism and the U.S.'s rightful
11 insistence against the development of nuclear weapons
12 in North Korea and Iran, the sheer vulnerability of
13 nuclear facilities and weapons combined with their
14 leverage in the acquisition of nuclear weapons ought
15 not simply to encourage the reduction but also to
16 oblige the virtual elimination of nuclear arms.

17 Third, nuclear dissuasion based on the
18 logic of fear is no longer legitimate. At the level
19 of security, it's time to move on and time to move
20 beyond mere deterrence to elimination of nuclear
21 weapons. Security based on force is no more
22 legitimate than peace based on terror.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Fourth, it is simply unacceptable that as
2 the world's foremost power, the United States lags
3 behind Europe and Australia in reducing subsidies for
4 and eradicating reliance on nuclear arms. We are
5 quite literally marching in the wrong direction from
6 the rest of the world and in the opposite direction
7 to what our planet requires.

8 Fifth, the question is not so much how
9 much more sophisticated our plants and weapons can
10 become but how serious we are as a nation to lead the
11 world with an alternative vision, a vision that
12 interprets power differently and promotes peaceful
13 coexistence globally. And the U.S. does have a
14 unique and historical role to play for the sake of
15 the planet's survival and the life of future
16 generations.

17 At our present moral and strategic
18 crossroads, the world needs to see the U.S. enforce a
19 step-by-step international and local reduction and
20 even prohibition of nuclear facilities and weapons,
21 not their replacement, not their refurbishment.
22 Instead, what do they see? They see an unrestrained

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 drive to impose absolute global superiority in
2 weaponry.

3 Simply put, U.S. action will invariably
4 encourage and invite reaction by other nations. It's
5 time for some self-reflection, a reconsideration of
6 our grave political and moral responsibility on a
7 global level.

8 The Complex 2030 plan should not be
9 approved by Congress. I am actually unhappy with all
10 of the alternatives. The statement that I have
11 signed, my church has signed, has offered an amended
12 third alternative.

13 Isolationist policies that do not take
14 seriously the opinion of informed citizens that
15 overlook partnership and cooperation with key
16 community sectors, including religious institutions,
17 are dangerously narrow-minded and short-sighted.

18 Complex 2030 is not the way forward.
19 Progressive and concerted decommissioning is the only
20 viable pledge for long-term moral and courageous
21 leadership.

22 Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (Applause.)

2 FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. Jodi Dart?
3 And Lawrence Egbert will follow.

4 MS. DART: Good afternoon. My name is
5 Jodi Dart. I am the Program Director with the
6 Alliance for Nuclear Accountability in the
7 Washington, D.C. office representing communities
8 downwind and downstream from the nuclear weapons
9 complex.

10 We are opposed to all three options that
11 are under consideration for the Complex 2030.
12 Specifically, the proposed action option actually
13 increases nuclear weapons design and research
14 activity resulting in increased hazardous waste,
15 emissions of dangerous radionuclides into the air,
16 and pollution to ground and surface waters.

17 The Complex 2030 planning scenario is
18 actually being marketed as a smaller, more modern
19 nuclear weapons complex. However, the facts tell a
20 different story. None of the eight sides will be
21 closed, and they will go from eight sides to eight
22 sides.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Complex 2030 also includes a proposal to
2 construct new facilities, including the consolidated
3 plutonium center. This new plutonium center would
4 increase plutonium pit production up to 125 pits
5 annually.

6 Building new nuclear weapons along with
7 increasing plutonium pit production is hazardous to
8 human health and the environment and undermines U.S.
9 obligations to nonproliferation treaties.

10 The Department of Energy is currently not
11 meeting its legal responsibilities to clean up the
12 legacy of more than 60 years of radioactive and toxic
13 contamination. Instead, DOE is now promoting
14 additional nuclear activities under Complex 2030 that
15 will create more pollution and threaten the health of
16 future generations.

17 Currently water near some of DOE's
18 facilities, such as Paducah, Kentucky and Pantex,
19 Texas remain unfit to drink. Some of the nation's
20 major water sources, including the Columbia River and
21 the Snake River aquifer, are threatened.

22 Back in 2004, the Alliance for Nuclear

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Accountability did a scientific analysis of 13
2 contaminated sites within the DOE nuclear weapons
3 complex. We ask that the DOE respond to the findings
4 in the report regarding residual contamination as
5 well as any future contamination resulting from
6 NNSA's plans to proceed with Complex 2030 to
7 transform the nuclear weapons complex.

8 DOE has constantly struggled with cleanup
9 obligations, including cleanup of the former pit
10 production site at Rocky Flats. The Rocky Flats
11 plant had a horrible environmental record with
12 accidents that only by luck did not severely
13 contaminate Denver.

14 Given the massive contamination at Rocky
15 Flats from past plutonium pit production, the
16 supplemental environmental impact statement should
17 discuss the environmental and health impacts at Rocky
18 Flats and other plutonium fabrication sites around
19 the world as the baseline.

20 Because the manufacture of plutonium pits
21 produces extremely hazardous and difficult-to-contain
22 waste, it is a great risk to health and the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 environment. The NNSA should carefully examine the
2 risk to the workers who build and then work in the
3 proposed plutonium center and also the risks to the
4 environment and communities around the site and those
5 that are downwind and downstream.

6 Complex 2030 would also result in the
7 development of new nuclear weapons with the reliable
8 replacement warhead being first off the line.
9 Ultimately if the U.S. added untested nuclear weapons
10 to the extensively tested stockpile, pressure to
11 resume nuclear weapons testing could occur not only
12 in the U.S. but in other countries as well.

13 The current nuclear weapons stockpile is
14 already reliable. As stated earlier, for over nine
15 years, the U.S. nuclear stockpile continues to be
16 certified as safe and reliable without the addition
17 of the reliable replacement warheads.

18 More importantly, the latest plutonium
19 pit lifetime study by DOE's own scientists confirms
20 that the plutonium pits have a minimum lifetime of at
21 least 100 years, calling into question the need for
22 new nuclear weapons as proposed by NNSA.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Building new nuclear weapons would divert
2 energy and resources from the need to plan for
3 further nuclear reductions and the eventual
4 elimination of such weapons.

5 Designing and building new nuclear
6 weapons would send a message to the rest of the world
7 that the U.S. intends to retain the ability to
8 produce and maintain a large-scale nuclear arsenal in
9 violation of its commitment to Article VI of the
10 nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

11 The nonproliferation treaty is already in
12 danger of unravelling, as demonstrated by North
13 Korea's recent nuclear test and the nuclear standoff
14 with Iran.

15 The U.S. plan to build new nuclear
16 weapons will further undermine the nonproliferation
17 regime. The U.S. foreign policy of do as I say and
18 not as I do is not a viable option.

19 ANA supports, as our director had stated
20 earlier, a curatorship approach, which maintains the
21 current stockpile through surveillance, non-nuclear
22 testing, and repair, which could accomplish the major

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 stated goals of Complex 2030.

2 Our main goal should be to clean up the
3 legacy of radioactive and toxic contamination from
4 the past 60 years of nuclear weapons production and
5 reducing the threat of nuclear weapons. Dismantling
6 warheads from our massive arsenal would set a great
7 example to the rest of the world.

8 Thank you for considering my comments.
9 Please enter them along with a copy which I brought
10 of the ANA report, "Danger Lurks Below: The Threat
11 to Major Water Supplies from the U.S. Nuclear Weapons
12 Complex." Thank you.

13 FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks.

14 (Applause.)

15 FACILITATOR BROWN: Lawrence Egbert? And
16 Mark Gubrud will follow.

17 MR. EGBERT: My name is Lawrence Egbert.

18 I am a volunteer in the Washington office of the
19 Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations.

20 Unitarian Universalists don't usually like to agree
21 with everybody else, but so far I guess we're stuck
22 with that this afternoon.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 (Laughter.)

2 MR. EGBERT: We would like the Department
3 of Energy to realize that in 1961, the Unitarians and
4 Universalists got together. So two denominations
5 became one.

6 We got together with our diverse ideas.
7 And one of the first things we did was to urge that
8 the United States government proceed with sincere,
9 conscientious, and continuing negotiations for a
10 treaty to effectively ban the development and testing
11 of nuclear weapons. That's one of the first things
12 we did as we gathered together in becoming one
13 denomination.

14 Since that statement, the UUA has passed
15 over 25 statements, pushing in General Assembly,
16 pushing for nonproliferation, immediate cessation of
17 nuclear testing, and universal disarmament.

18 Grounded in this long history of activism
19 against the proliferation of nuclear weapons,
20 Unitarian Universalist Association is firmly opposed
21 to the proposed Complex 2030 program and any step to
22 replace, rebuild, or revive our nuclear weapons or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 our nuclear weapons programs.

2 North Korea's recent nuclear test gives
3 you a little reminder of the urgency of this. It
4 gives you a reminder that the attempts with a
5 nonproliferation treaty are very possibly unraveling.

6 This U.S. plan to build our nuclear
7 weapons plants will further undermine the
8 nonproliferation regime treaty. U.S. policy to do as
9 I say and not as I do has already been mentioned.
10 We'll repeat it. It is not good moral position to
11 say something to someone else and not do it yourself.

12 Furthermore, the question must be asked,
13 what is the useful role for nuclear deterrence in an
14 age where the greatest declared threat comes from
15 non-state terrorist groups and proliferation of
16 weapons to other states.

17 The only modernization we need is a
18 political thinking and strategic vision. The most
19 reliable replacement for the dangers posed by nuclear
20 weapons is systematic denuclearization. That word is
21 not in the dictionary yet, but it will be someday.

22 Indeed, at a time when U.S. credibility

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 or influence abroad is already dangerously low,
2 thanks to our aggressive behavior in Iraq, the last
3 thing we need do is to be seen as initiating a new
4 phase in the nuclear arms race. Improved nuclear
5 weapons will not make us safer.

6 Rather than using U.S. dollars and
7 leadership to expand our capability to kill thousands
8 of people with a touch of a button, we seek U.S.
9 leadership in reducing the number of nuclear weapons.

10 We seek decommissioning, not refurbishing.

11 I would like to add also that I am a
12 physician and I am the President of Physicians for
13 Social Responsibility in Baltimore, Maryland and
14 remind you that a few years ago, we, physicians in
15 the group, hired some nationally known researchers to
16 evaluate the research programs going on that had been
17 done and published, that is, only published research,
18 that had been done by the DOE or sponsored by the
19 DOE. And this is a warning as you hear of material
20 because we were able to show at a scientific level
21 the highest quality research that comes from the DOE
22 up a few years ago was essentially always faulty,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 always biased, and always set up to cover up the
2 possible hazards of this. And I am wishing you have
3 a copy up here somewhere.

4 I would like to say that, in conclusion,
5 what David Culp has said a few minutes ago, that the
6 numerous denominations were in agreement on what he
7 was presenting, that the Unitarian Universalist
8 Association is also one of those.

9 Thank you.

10 (Applause.)

11 FACILITATOR BROWN: Mark? And Alan
12 Gamble will follow.

13 MR. GUBRUD: Thank you.

14 My name is Mark Gubrud. I am a graduate
15 student in experimental physics, nanotechnology
16 stuff. So I think about the future. I also have a
17 daughter who is six years old, which makes me think
18 even more of the future.

19 I want to address the scope of the
20 environmental impact statement for Complex 2030, but
21 first I wanted to address a couple of Mr. Wyka's more
22 wide-ranging remarks. The point that the United

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 States may need to be responsive to changes in the
2 global security environment or emerging threats, I
3 just wonder what change in the global security
4 environment or what new threat could emerge that
5 would require a response in terms of producing new
6 nuclear weapons and which would emerge more rapidly
7 than the United States would be able to do so in that
8 circumstance.

9 If we look at the period 1945 to 1955,
10 for example, I think we have some idea of how rapidly
11 the United States can respond. And it needs to.

12 Secondly, with regard to the finding that
13 pit lifetimes, much longer than had previously been
14 estimated, maybe 100 years, if you acknowledge that,
15 then you go on to say, "Well, we need the ability to
16 refurbish the weapons systems because there are other
17 components besides pits." Well, fine. Then why do
18 you need the production capacity for new pits?

19 Now, with regard to the scope of the EIS,
20 I'm thinking of a proposal to build a new coal-fired
21 power station. And the people that want to do this
22 say they are going to produce an environmental impact

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 statement.

2 And they go off and do their work. And
3 they come back, and they say, "Well, this plant isn't
4 going to be very tall. So it's not going to impact
5 the skyline. And it's not going to harm the fish in
6 the local stream. It's not really going to interfere
7 with the birds too much. And the deer aren't going
8 to mind." And they say nothing about the thousands
9 of tons of sulfur dioxide carbon and soot and carbon
10 dioxide and mercury, whatever that the planet is
11 going to be spewing into the atmosphere.

12 Well, we would say, "This is ridiculous.
13 You have addressed some of the smaller issues, but
14 you haven't addressed the largest issue or the
15 largest potential environmental impact from your
16 proposed project." And in this regard, it seems to
17 me that the EIS must address the issue of
18 proliferation and the likelihood of nuclear war and
19 how that will be impacted by this project.

20 Certainly people are rightly concerned
21 about the potential leakage of hazardous materials
22 into the environment, tritium, plutonium, whatnot,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 but I suppose you can come up with very clear
2 statements as to what technology has used to ensure
3 that the same thing doesn't happen that happened at
4 Hanford, at Pantex, at Savannah River, et cetera,
5 some of the worst environmental disaster sites in
6 this country.

7 But, of course, that's not nearly as bad
8 as what happened in the former Soviet Union or what
9 may be happening in China, in India, in Pakistan, in
10 North Korea, and in the newest member: Iran.

11 So certainly if you narrow the scope of
12 environmental issues to simply release potential
13 toxic materials into the environment, by far the
14 largest impact that is likely to come from the United
15 States commissioning a new nuclear weapons production
16 complex is what we will happen in other countries.
17 So I really think you need to address those issues as
18 environmental impact issues in a classic sense.

19 Now, in the broader sense of
20 environmental impacts, I would think you would
21 consider, particularly if the term "human
22 environment" is relevant -- I'm not sure I know quite

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 what that means, but I would think that you would
2 consider the impact of this project on the quality of
3 life for human beings in the environment.

4 And I must tell you I think we all
5 understand the meaning of this. Nuclear weapons
6 pollute our world just by their mere existence. They
7 make life in this world substantially unpleasant, the
8 continual threat of nuclear annihilation, the end of
9 civilization as we know it, widespread destruction of
10 the environment.

11 I would say that nuclear weapons have had
12 a major negative impact on my quality of life. And,
13 of course, if the weapons are ever used again in war,
14 then that's when the real impact will be felt.

15 So, anyway, I don't know that you are
16 going to address the sort of human environment issue
17 that I raised, but I certainly think that you do need
18 to address the proliferation and likelihood of war as
19 being the source of the largest potential
20 environmental impact from this proposed complex.

21 Thank you.

22 (Applause.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. Thanks.

2 Alan Gamble? Robert Nelson will be next.

3 MR. GAMBLE: I am Alan Gamble. I speak
4 to you today as a member, individual member, of the
5 High Faith and also work toward establishing the
6 religious freedom peace tax fund, one tax. The
7 citizens would be able to pay all of their taxes
8 without being compelled to violate their beliefs and
9 regarding personal responsibility in war. I do
10 appreciate the work that you all have tried to put
11 into this and appreciate all the comments that have
12 been given today.

13 I really come from a tradition where I
14 was challenged to love my enemies, as many of us
15 were. I come from a family that sought to live
16 holistic and responsible lives. And I come from a
17 country who was founded on liberty of conscience and
18 the freedom to exercise one's faith. For those roots
19 and for the many others, I am very deeply thankful.

20 I believe it is a sin to build a nuclear
21 weapon, a sin to use one, a sin to intend or to
22 threaten to use one, a sin to possess one, a sin to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pay for one. In the peace tax campaign, we are
2 working to find a way to transform a policy which
3 effectively compels people to financially participate
4 in all of these sins. They must choose between
5 voluntary impoverishment or, else, break either their
6 beliefs or the law.

7 Nuclear weapons are one of the
8 present-day idols. Manufactured by our own hands and
9 imagination, giving us vain illusions of security and
10 power, these weapons cause a double violence. They
11 kill when they are used. And they kill, even when
12 not used, by denying the critical resources to
13 programs of social uplift.

14 People only do what we do. Courageous
15 leaders admit when they make mistakes. We can be a
16 country who leads because it is loved and respected,
17 rather than by being feared as a bully.

18 We need to ask ourselves, will the U.S.
19 ever really use a single one of the several thousand
20 active weapons we have? By what logic are nuclear
21 weapons possessed by some countries like ours
22 acceptable while others are not? It takes a lot of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 arrogance not to see the hypocrisy.

2 Like an insane drug addict, money keeps
3 on pouring in while we stray further and further from
4 conscience and the truth. I apologize for not
5 directing more of my comments to the specific
6 statements, but one obviously -- like in page 17 of
7 the slides, some things left out, obviously difficult
8 to measure, are the impact on our spiritual lives.
9 And I think that's collectively what we have here
10 today. How do we measure the impact of the loss of
11 our souls maybe?

12 Having said all of this, I don't believe
13 that we should hold any illusions that by banning or
14 divesting ourselves of nuclear weapons, that we will
15 remove any of the causes, the root causes, of war.
16 People are first killed in our minds. And as long as
17 religious, patriotic, or political prejudices
18 continue, then genuine justice cannot become an
19 Earthly reality.

20 Leader of the high faith named Abdu'l
21 Baha, meaning servant of glory, said, "Universal
22 peace is an impossibility through human or material

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 agencies. It must be through spiritual power. There
2 is need of a universal impelling force, which shall
3 establish the oneness of humanity and destroy the
4 foundations of war and strife. None other than the
5 divine power can do this. Therefore, it will be
6 accomplished through the breath of the Holy Spirit."

7 I encourage each of you to read a
8 statement that is by the Universal House of Justice
9 called "The Promise of World Peace" in this book and
10 also a book by Richard McSorley, It's a Sin to Build
11 a Nuclear Weapon, and several other comments and
12 books, I'm sure.

13 I believe as we grow out of our stormy
14 adolescence, we will inevitably rediscover our
15 genuine security in God and our common humanity.

16 Finally, I am reminded of the words by
17 Rev. Martin Luther King, who said, "Cowardice asks
18 the question, is it safe? Is it safe? Expediency
19 asks the question, is it politic? Vanity asks the
20 question, is it popular? But conscience asks the
21 question, is it right?"

22 Now, there comes a time when one must

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 take a position that is neither safe nor politic nor
2 popular, but one must take it because conscience
3 tells one that it is right.

4 Thank you. I wish you all open and
5 courageous hearts. And thank you for the opportunity
6 and honor to speak with you today.

7 (Applause.)

8 FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks.

9 Robert Nelson? And Michele Boyd will be
10 next.

11 MR. R. NELSON: Good afternoon. My name
12 is Robert Nelson. I am a senior scientist at the
13 Union of Concerned Scientists. I didn't have time to
14 prepare a formal writing today. So I'm just going to
15 speak from a few notes.

16 A number of people have mentioned the
17 JASON report. And I don't need to go over that in
18 detail but just to emphasize that the JASON report
19 really undercuts the primary justification that NNSA
20 has been advertising for the development of the
21 reliable replacement warhead.

22 There is a reason why they chose the word

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 "reliable" in the name. It's because it makes the
2 public and our policy-makers believe that there must
3 be something unreliable about the existing stockpile.

4 It plants a seed. And even though the labs have
5 certified the stockpile every year since 1997 as
6 being safe and reliable, they want to somehow give
7 you the impression that in the future something might
8 go wrong.

9 Well, the JASON report didn't say that
10 the pits will become unreliable in 85 to 100 years.
11 It said at a minimum of 85 to 100 years.

12 I spoke to one of the panel members a few
13 weeks ago. And I said, "Is there anything in your
14 studies that would prove that the pits could not last
15 1,000 years?"

16 And he said, "No." Okay? It's a minimum
17 lifetime.

18 There was an earlier JASON report in
19 1995, leading up to the debate over the beginnings of
20 stockpile stewardship and an endorsement of the
21 comprehensive test ban. The JASONS endorsed the
22 stockpile stewardship program, our current program

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for maintaining safety and reliability of the current
2 stockpile through maintaining them through constant
3 surveillance and remanufacturing them according to
4 original specifications, but they remain an important
5 qualifier.

6 They first said they're assuming that
7 there would not be a decision to try to develop new
8 capabilities; for example, the bunker buster and
9 other types of weapons. But also they said we must
10 resist the temptation to make changes, even if aimed
11 at small improvements, because it is just those kinds
12 of changes that will create doubt in the minds of not
13 only our technicians but in our policy-makers further
14 down the line to say, "Well, gee, how are we going to
15 replace our existing weapons with an untested
16 weapon?"

17 My concern is that we're going to have a
18 situation where today the labs tell us that the
19 weapons are reliable, we'll never have to test, but
20 ten years from now somebody will say, "Well, gee, how
21 can I really be sure? We really do need to test
22 them."

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 My second point is I guess more personal,
2 more philosophical for me. I brought my son down
3 with me today, Arthur. He's the 11-year-old in the
4 back there. Last Christmas I gave him the present of
5 a trip down to Washington. And he, understandably,
6 wanted payment before December 25th of this year. So
7 I decided to bring him to this meeting.

8 (Laughter.)

9 MR. R. NELSON: You know, what is complex
10 --

11 FACILITATOR BROWN: Bring him up.

12 MR. R. NELSON: He's a little too shy.
13 He didn't want to come up.

14 You know, at the end of the cold war, the
15 world really had a sigh of relief that somehow the
16 threat of nuclear annihilation was going to be over
17 and that somehow we would find our way out of this
18 horrible arms race.

19 That public debate hasn't happened yet,
20 and it is high time that Congress and the public ask
21 ourselves "What is the propose of maintaining 10,000
22 nuclear weapons, thousands of them on high alert, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 same kind of posture we had during the cold war?"
2 It's over. We need to get rid of them.

3 What is Complex 2030 about? It's about
4 maintaining nuclear weapons forever. In 2030, my son
5 will be my age. What kind of world are we going to
6 give him? That is what I am concerned about. It is
7 high time that, instead of building up the nuclear
8 complex and building new nuclear weapons, that we
9 find ways to make drastic cuts in our existing
10 stockpile.

11 So I'll just end it there.

12 FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks.

13 (Applause.)

14 FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. Michele Boyd?

15 And Rev. Joseph Nangle is next.

16 MS. BOYD: My name is Michele Boyd. I am
17 the Legislative Director of Public Citizen's Energy
18 Program. Most of my work at Public Citizen -- we are
19 a 35-year-old public, national public, interest
20 organization. Most of my work actually focuses on
21 the other side of the nuclear coin, on nuclear power.

22 So why am I here today? Because we are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 really looking at one coin. We cannot get rid of
2 nuclear weapons as long as we have nuclear power and
3 we cannot go to nuclear power and the dangers of
4 nuclear power until we get rid of nuclear weapons.
5 And that is the fact.

6 Forty-two countries are weapons-capable.
7 Why are they weapons-capable? They're considered
8 weapons-capable because they have nuclear power. If
9 implemented, DOE's proposed Complex 2030 will make
10 the world much less safe. It will convince, at least
11 to some, if not all eventually, of those 42
12 weapons-capable countries to turn their power program
13 into a weapons program.

14 At a time when the United States is
15 trying to encourage and convince other countries who
16 are not our friends, as President Bush likes to tell
17 us, North Korea, Iran, to halt their weapons
18 programs, it simply does not make sense for us to be
19 developing new nuclear weapons.

20 We currently have 10,000 nuclear weapons
21 and thousands of them on hair-trigger alert. This is
22 an incomprehensible number of weapons. There is no

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plausible scenario whereby we could even use a small
2 fraction of that number. We should be dismantling
3 our existing weapons, not developing new ones.

4 And, as has been said here before
5 numerous times, do as I say, not as I do is not a
6 persuasive argument. And we can see that when we're
7 looking at uranium enrichment. We already have
8 numerous countries who have decided, say, if the
9 uranium enrichment door is going to be closing, darn
10 if I'm not just going to get my toe in that door.
11 And now there are lots of countries who are
12 considering building uranium enrichment plants.

13 We know this is going to happen. This
14 has happened time and time again. This is not new.
15 We need to learn from history. And, as has been said
16 numerous times, bombplex violates international law.

17 Under Article VI of the nuclear nonproliferation
18 treaty, the United States is obligated to work
19 towards nuclear disarmament.

20 Building a new generation of nuclear
21 weapons sends a message to the rest of the world the
22 U.S. doesn't give squat about its disarmament program

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 -- about its disarmament obligations. We don't have
2 a program for disarmament yet.

3 The message that the United States would
4 send to the rest of the world be designing and
5 building new nuclear weapons could bring down the
6 already very seriously damaged MPT.

7 The United States is actively hindering
8 international nonproliferation initiatives and
9 crippling international nuclear disarmament efforts
10 through this bombplex proposal.

11 The current stockpile of nuclear weapons
12 is proven reliable, unfortunately, but it's the fact
13 and will last for many decades. The recent report by
14 the JASON panel, which has been discussed by many
15 people here, concludes that plutonium pits have
16 lifetimes of at least 85 years. I hope personally
17 not to be here in 85 years still talking about this
18 issue.

19 The aging of plutonium in U.S. nuclear
20 weapons will not affect the reliability of the
21 weapons for a very, very long time. And in the
22 meantime, the U.S. should be focused on its

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 obligations under the MPT to disarm, not developing
2 new weapons, with the goal of indefinite perpetuation
3 of nuclear weapons.

4 Bombplex. One last point I want to make
5 is that bombplex is outrageously expensive and
6 polluting. Just building the facilities for the
7 bombplex will cost more than \$150 billion. Given
8 DOE's really atrocious track record on large nuclear
9 projects, I can guarantee you it will be twice that,
10 three times that, four times that.

11 This amount does not even include the
12 annual cost of running the facilities and, more
13 importantly, cleaning up the mess, which we haven't
14 done. We haven't cleaned up the mess from the last
15 time around.

16 I find it really appalling, actually,
17 that the Department of Energy would propose making
18 more of these environmental and health threats before
19 it has figured out even how to clean up the cold war
20 legacy.

21 The Bush administration regularly tells
22 the American public that the greatest threat to our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 national security is terrorism. Nuclear weapons are
2 not a deterrent for terrorists, but nuclear
3 materials, on the other hand, do give another
4 potential method of terrorizing.

5 It is nearly the year 2007. DOE, the
6 cold war is over. It is well past the time that DOE
7 recognizes this fact and permanently abandon this
8 outdated and dangerous proposal to design and build
9 new nuclear weapons.

10 Thank you.

11 (Applause.)

12 FACILITATOR BROWN: Is the Rev. Joseph
13 Nangle here? Okay. We are scheduled to stay
14 available for speakers until 5:00 o'clock. So there
15 anybody else who would like to speak at this time?

16 Okay. We are through the list of those
17 who signed up. What we will do, then, is we will --
18 would you like to speak? Fine. Okay. Again, if
19 you'll just step to the microphone and identify
20 yourself?

21 MR. YOUNG: My name is Stephen Young. I
22 work with a group called the Union of Concerned

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Scientists, but I'm speaking today as a human being,
2 a person. I am sorry I am crying. I am.

3 I just want to remind you of a few
4 things. The first thing is that two weapons ended
5 World War II in Japan, two. And we're proposing to
6 have 2,000 on alert, thousands more in reserve.

7 Why? Why? That makes no sense. I'm
8 sorry. It does not. The DOE is doing its job, it's
9 told. It's doing what the President and the Pentagon
10 tells it to do.

11 We learned that in Germany, at Nuremberg,
12 that is not the right answer. You must do what is
13 right, not what you are told to do.

14 Thank you.

15 FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks, Stephen.

16 (Applause.)

17 FACILITATOR BROWN: Is there anyone else
18 who would like to speak? Yes? I'm sorry to make you
19 walk all this way. Dennis Nelson, right?

20 MR. D. NELSON: Yes.

21 FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay, Dennis.

22 MR. D. NELSON: Yes. I would like to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 follow up on a point that I was going to make but I
2 didn't quite have time to make earlier.

3 FACILITATOR BROWN: Fine. Okay.

4 MR. D. NELSON: And that was this concept
5 of deterrence. Who do we deter? For example, say
6 some rogue element in Pakistan gets a hold of a
7 nuclear weapon, either a Pakistani nuclear weapon or
8 say it's a suitcase bomb from the former Soviet
9 Union. It's portable. They can have a cruise car or
10 whatever. You could drive it into the middle of
11 Washington, D.C. and detonate it. How does the U.S.
12 respond to that? What is our deterrent response? Do
13 we attack Pakistan?

14 After 9/11, I guess we should have
15 attacked Saudi Arabia, you know, nuked Riyadh because
16 most of the 9/11 hijackers were Saudis. So who do
17 you actually attack? Who do you nuke?

18 And to me this is a huge dilemma that I
19 haven't been able to resolve? And if you nuke the
20 wrong person, what does that do? Is that moral? Do
21 you then nuke Teheran and Pyongyang because some
22 Third World Arab decided that he had a bone to pick

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with the United States?

2 I just don't understand it, and I don't
3 think that anybody has a handle on this. And until
4 they do, it's absolutely ludicrous to create a
5 policy, a national defense policy, based on a
6 deterrence when we don't know how to deter. And
7 nuclear weapons certainly can't deter that.

8 FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks very much.

9 Okay. Anyone else at this time? Yes,
10 Mark?

11 MR. GUBRUD: I'll speak to Steve. You
12 know, I can't match what you did in your statement.
13 I kind of wish I could because it seems very
14 appropriate to me.

15 I grew up under the shadow of nuclear
16 annihilation. Four years old in New York City, I
17 became aware that I was a target for a bomb. How did
18 I become aware of this? Well, I was in school. And
19 there was a bomb drill. We had to go down to the
20 basement. Everybody had to go down to the basement.

21 Why were we going down to the basement? Because of
22 the bomb. Bomb? What bomb? This is how I learned

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about it.

2 And, of course, seeing the Vietnam War on
3 television and realizing that if we could go to the
4 other side of the world and make a war, war could
5 just as well come here. It seems a little
6 simplistic, but there is some truth to that.

7 And, boy, you know, when 1990 came and,
8 boy, the cold war is over, oh, my God. And then you
9 saw these people mobbing over the Berlin Wall,
10 tearing it down, crossing the border, celebrations.
11 I thought to myself, shouldn't we all be running down
12 to the local missile silos and tearing those things
13 down? Isn't this now the time? You would have
14 thought so.

15 I mean, all the time that I grew up
16 during the cold war, darkest days of the cold war, we
17 were told that this is why we were doing it, because
18 the bad Soviets other there had all these nukes they
19 were going to come at us. If we didn't have ours to
20 threaten them back, that was the reason. Well, gee,
21 all that came to an end. You would have thought we
22 would have gotten away from it then. It didn't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 happen.

2 Why not? Here we are going on 20 years
3 later, and we're talking about a new weapons -- you
4 know, restarting nuclear weapons production next year
5 and building a new complex so that we can be building
6 them better and smarter in the year 2030.

7 This is really crazy, folks. This is
8 really crazy. You know, it calls for shouting and
9 screaming and crying. It's nuts. And we hear about
10 this. The decision have been made by the Nuclear
11 Weapons Council. I'm like who are these people, the
12 Nuclear Weapons Council?

13 Do they wear druid hats and wear robes
14 and peer into the alignment of the stars and figure
15 out what our policy has to be for mysterious reasons
16 that the rest of us don't understand? Where is this
17 coming from?

18 The President signs it. Well, we know
19 something about him. Where is this coming from? How
20 is our nation making these decisions? We're going to
21 continue to hold onto these thousands of nuclear
22 weapons and threaten the world with them and say,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 "Oh." And we're going to plan to have them for
2 decades into the future.

3 Where is the debate? There isn't any
4 debate. This is here in this room where we're
5 supposed to be talking about the scope of the
6 programmatic environmental impact statement for this
7 program. This is it. This is the national debate
8 right here in this room.

9 And I don't even see a full room. You
10 know, where are the 5,000 people who should be
11 mobbing the halls and protesting outside or -- I
12 don't know -- expressing their support for nuclear
13 weapons if that's what they think? I don't know.
14 This is it. This is the public debate right here.

15 This is crazy. We're making this fateful
16 decision. Are we? I don't know. Maybe not. Maybe
17 this is just all smoke and mirrors. But you would
18 think, you know, ostensibly at least we're here to
19 make a fateful decision about what we're going to be
20 doing with regard to nuclear weapons for decades to
21 come. And it comes down to this? I mean, this is
22 silly.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 FACILITATOR BROWN: Let me see if anybody
2 else has anything to add.

3 (No response.)

4 FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. Thanks.
5 Anyone else? The person who is stuck in traffic is
6 still stuck in traffic? Okay. Well --

7 PARTICIPANT: It looks like he is signing
8 in.

9 FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. Again, traffic
10 being what it is, I don't know if people want to --
11 if people do need to leave, they can go ahead. And I
12 guess we do have another speaker who has just
13 arrived, I believe, and will be available soon.

14 We'll recess briefly, and we'll wait for
15 the next speaker to arrive.

16 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
17 the record at 3:58 p.m. and went back on the record
18 at 4:09 p.m.)

19 FACILITATOR BROWN: I was going to ask
20 our speaker to give a traffic report first.

21 THE REV. NANGLE: I can do that.

22 FACILITATOR BROWN: Just when you all are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 heading home, get the latest.

2 THE REV. NANGLE: Sure. The Metro is
3 running really well.

4 FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. There it is.

5 THE REV. NANGLE: It got me here.

6 FACILITATOR BROWN: Again, if you all
7 would take your seats? Thanks.

8 So The Reverend Joseph Nangle and --

9 THE REV. NANGLE: Thank you.

10 FACILITATOR BROWN: Welcome.

11 THE REV. NANGLE: Thank you so much.

12 This is what you call the caboose.

13 FACILITATOR BROWN: Yes.

14 THE REV. NANGLE: And I will be brief
15 because I am sure I am talking to the choir here.
16 But just to register the opinion of Pax Christi
17 U.S.A., which I represent, Pax Christi U.S.A. is the
18 Catholic peace movement, officially Catholic peace
19 movement. We represent 142 Catholic bishops, 6,650
20 religious congregations of men and women, religious
21 orders, and 357 local Pax Christi chapters across the
22 United States. We're also an international movement.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And so I am sure I reflect the views of that large
2 group of people across the world.

3 You probably don't know that in 1945, at
4 the end of the second world war, when the United
5 States dropped two nuclear devices on two cities in
6 Japan, the Vatican was outspoken in its condemnation
7 of that act of war. That was in 1945.

8 Since the founding of Pax Christi, the
9 group that I represent, in 1972, we have opposed the
10 possession, even the possession, of nuclear weapons,
11 the development of nuclear weapons testing,
12 deployment, and threatened use. We have called it in
13 our terms a sinful affront to any moral order and a
14 theft from billions of people across the world, men
15 and women who daily struggle to find dignity in life
16 amidst devastating and dehumanizing poverty.

17 I spent a lot of years in South America,
18 15 years, actually. And I saw what the arms race
19 does to people. I was standing outside the
20 Children's Hospital in Lima, Peru with a dying baby
21 one day. We never got inside the hospital because
22 there were too many like this child ahead of us.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And as we stood there and that child's
2 life ebbed away, I noticed flying overhead supersonic
3 jet airplanes that the Peruvian military had bought
4 from France in this case at the cost of \$144 million,
5 \$144 million in supersonic jet planes.

6 The Peruvian military had no use for
7 those. They were toys for that establishment. And,
8 yet, here they were spending all that money when we
9 didn't have enough children's hospitals and emergency
10 rooms and nurses and doctors to save the lives of all
11 those children that I was standing with outside of
12 that hospital. So that's why we have this total
13 aversion to more arms and especially nuclear arms.

14 As you know so well, the estimated cost
15 of Complex 2030 is an additional \$150 billion to
16 enable the United States to replace every warhead in
17 its arsenal. We find this is an unacceptable
18 continuation of a morally abhorrent policy.

19 The Catholic Church generally has had
20 severe questions about nuclear arms from the
21 beginning of this nuclear age. In 1981 -- I
22 mentioned the Vatican in 1945. In 1981, Pope John

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Paul II offered just a conditioned moral acceptance
2 of nuclear deterrence as an interim measure in the
3 path to nuclear disarmament.

4 And then at the end of the cold war, the
5 church began to take a much more rigid stand, calling
6 for the outlawing of nuclear weapons in the same way
7 that chemical and biological weapons have been
8 outlawed.

9 Weapons of mass destruction, which we so
10 decried in our adventurism in Iraq, have no place in
11 the civilized world. The delegate to the United
12 Nations in 2002 spoke this way about these weapons.
13 There can be no moral acceptance of military
14 doctrines that embody the permanence of nuclear
15 weapons. Those weapons resist negotiations should,
16 therefore, be strongly urged to finally come to the
17 negotiating table.

18 And then another ambassador to the U.N.
19 from the Vatican spoke in these terms, "The Holy See
20 has never countenanced nuclear deterrence as a
21 permanent measure, nor does it today when it is
22 evidence that nuclear deterrence drives the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 development of ever newer nuclear arms, thus
2 preventing genuine nuclear disarmament."

3 And here we are presented with another
4 proposal to invest massive amounts of money, as much
5 as 150 billion over the next 10 years, to ensure the
6 viability of our nuclear deterrent for the rest of
7 the Twenty-First Century.

8 It's kind of madness, really. It's just
9 total madness. Where does it end? When will the
10 insanity and immorality of mass investments in
11 weapons of nuclear destruction finally be rejected?

12 I find it just terribly counterproductive
13 and counter-intuitive that we decry even the
14 slightest inclination of Iran to move in this
15 direction, enhancement of material that might
16 possibly be used for nuclear weapons. And here we
17 are going forward with a brand new program. We have
18 just allowed our friends in India to receive nuclear
19 weapons, too. It's just a kind of a crazy world we
20 find ourselves in.

21 So, in sum, in the name of our Pax
22 Christi U.S.A. family, as I mentioned, 142 bishops

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and 650 religious communities of men and women, and
2 350 local Pax Christi chapters across the United
3 States, our fervent hope is that the time is now.
4 Nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we
5 seek in the Twenty-First Century. And we totally,
6 totally oppose Complex 2030 for that reason.

7 I am grateful for your time and for your
8 patience and for allowing me to come in at the end
9 and make these comments. Thank you so much.

10 FACILITATOR BROWN: Thank you.

11 Well, it turns out you will not have to
12 have the onus of being the caboose. There is another
13 speaker who has signed up: Kevin Kamps.

14 MR. KAMPS: Hello. My name is Kevin
15 Kamps. And I speak on behalf of Nuclear Information
16 and Resource Service based here in Washington, D.C.
17 We are a watchdog organization focused on the nuclear
18 power industry.

19 And, for that reason, because my normal
20 day job is working on high-level radioactive waste
21 issues on the commercial side of the nuclear coin, I
22 am relying heavily on cheat sheets prepared by the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Oak Ridge Environmental Peace Alliance and the
2 Alliance for Nuclear Accountability and NucWatch
3 South. So I am very grateful to those organizations
4 for helping me get up to speed a little bit on these
5 issues. And so what I thought I would do is just go
6 down my cheat sheets and kind of add some thoughts
7 that I have on these issues.

8 One of the points made here is that the
9 U.S. cannot produce nuclear weapons while insisting
10 on other countries not to pursue nuclear
11 capabilities. And it's certainly ironic that this
12 proposal come out at this time with United States
13 policy towards Iran and North Korea being what it is
14 as well as the recent admission by Israel that it
15 indeed has a nuclear weapons arsenal as well. It's a
16 very provocative act by the United States at a time
17 of nearly unprecedented nuclear weapons proliferation
18 in the world.

19 And I would add that the Bush
20 administration and Department of Energy proposal to
21 launch the global nuclear energy partnership is
22 another very broad issue that needs to be included in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this environmental impact statement proceeding
2 because the overlap between these two proposals is
3 quite large. And, at least in the notice of intent
4 that I read in the Federal Register, there was no
5 mention of this other comprehensive proposal that
6 would take place at perhaps some of these same
7 Department of Energy facilities and certainly has
8 broad policy implications that overlap the broad
9 implications of this proposal of Complex 2030.

10 It's also ironic that this proposal in
11 this hearing at least happens just after a recent
12 report was unveiled at a geological conference, which
13 found that a nuclear winter would likely result, even
14 from a so-called limited nuclear war. And the
15 hypothetical scenario was the nuclear exchange of 100
16 Hiroshima-sized bombs.

17 And the findings were that even such a
18 so-called limited exchange, because of the
19 large-scale conflagrations that would take place in
20 the cities targeted due to the presence of large fuel
21 supplies and other combustible materials, would
22 result in a mini ice age that would have dire

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 consequences for the entire planet in terms of
2 agriculture being limited by 30 days per year, the
3 mass starvation that that would cause worldwide.

4 And given the fact that this proposal was
5 so provocative and could very well lead to a new arms
6 race, nuclear weapons proliferation, and the risks of
7 actual nuclear warfare that those entail, that should
8 be a part of the scope of this proceeding as well.

9 It's also ironic timing given the certain
10 signing of the U.S.-India nuclear deal by President
11 Bush in the next few days. And I think there is a
12 common pattern to all of these activities.

13 And that is a disregard by the United
14 States government of its obligations under the
15 nuclear nonproliferation treaty. The U.S.
16 Constitution holds treaties as the highest law of the
17 land, equal to the U.S. Constitution. And there
18 seems to be a disregard for that very important
19 treaty. And this proposal would further unravel that
20 treaty at a very inopportune time.

21 But this also reflects disregard for
22 other treaties. And I would point out that in this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 notice of intent, the Nevada test site is mentioned
2 as a possible location for some of these nuclear
3 weapons expansion activities to take place. And the
4 Nevada test site happens to belong to the Western
5 Shoshone tribe.

6 The Western Shoshone National Council has
7 made it abundantly clear to the Department of Energy
8 and its predecessor agencies extending back for
9 decades that nuclear weapons testing and other
10 nuclear activities at the Nevada test site are
11 unacceptable, they violate the treaty of Ruby Valley
12 of 1863, and this is another treaty that the United
13 States government needs to honor, respect, and obey.

14 I would also like to point out that the
15 Department of Energy's reliance on commercial nuclear
16 power plants for its source of tritium for hydrogen
17 bombs is a very provocative policy. It makes
18 commercial reactors in this country a part of the
19 U.S. military-industrial complex.

20 And at a time of concern about the risk
21 of terrorist attack and documentation, in fact, by
22 the 9/11 Commission that al Qaeda in its original

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plans for September 11th intended to hijack 10
2 commercial airliners and to crash 2 of them into
3 nuclear power plants in this country, it makes that
4 risk all the more real.

5 And the United States should certainly
6 not be setting such a bad example in the world at the
7 same time as it's promoting this global nuclear
8 energy partnership and this India-U.S. nuclear deal,
9 which would expand the so-called peaceful atom around
10 the world.

11 FACILITATOR BROWN: You are at the
12 five-minute mark, just to let you know.

13 MR. KAMPS: Okay.

14 FACILITATOR BROWN: And we do have
15 another speaker who has arrived.

16 MR. KAMPS: Okay. So I will just wrap up
17 with a few concluding thoughts. The irony is that
18 President Eisenhower, who gave his famous atoms for
19 peace speech in 1953, was also the same person who
20 gave his perhaps more famous military-industrial
21 complex speech when he left office.

22 And it appears that this Complex 2030

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 proposal is really all about corporate welfare for
2 the nuclear industry in this country and also -- and,
3 again, it's very similar to the GNEP proposal, a form
4 of welfare for the national nuclear laboratories.

5 The United States needs to be a leader in
6 realistic nuclear waste technology to deal with the
7 consequences of 60-plus years of nuclear waste
8 generation. And that does not include reprocessing.

9 That's why GNEP was such an unacceptable proposal.

10 So, instead of leading the world in the
11 wrong direction with this Complex 2030 proposal, the
12 United States should launch a Manhattan Project of a
13 different type. And that is to deal with the
14 consequences of the Manhattan Project that have
15 unfolded over the past 60 to 70 years to deal with
16 the waste, the contamination, the public health
17 impact of what has gone before. The United States
18 should not lead the world into this risky nuclear
19 weapons nightmare of proliferation, which Complex
20 2030 would launch.

21 And I think, with that, I will conclude
22 just with this last thought, that in the founding

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 document of the United States, the Declaration of
2 Independence, there is a passage that says, "When
3 government becomes inimical to these values," which
4 were life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,
5 "then it is the right and the responsibility of the
6 citizens to alter or abolish that government."

7 And I think that the Department of
8 Energy's proposal of Complex 2030 rises to the level
9 of inimical to life, liberty, and the pursuit of
10 happiness. And it will be the concerned citizens of
11 this country who put a stop to it for the benefit of
12 the entire world.

13 Thank you.

14 FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks.

15 (Applause.)

16 FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. Our next
17 speaker is Dr. Arjun Makhijani.

18 DR. MAKHIJANI: Thanks so much. I
19 appreciate this opportunity to present some testimony
20 to you for your scoping document. I am going to
21 present written comments later on, before January
22 17th.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I want to call attention to some specific
2 things that I think you should cover in your scope
3 that I didn't notice that are in your scoping
4 document.

5 A lot of my remarks relate specifically
6 to the Los Alamos National Lab, which has been given
7 a pretty prominent role already with a chemical and
8 metallurgical research building expansion and the
9 expansion of pit production there in addition to the
10 125 per year production capacity that's proposed for
11 a new pit production facility, which has not yet been
12 sited and will be sited as part of the proposed
13 process.

14 My concerns about Los Alamos are under a
15 lot of different categories. Let me start with the
16 most important security concern. I think Los Alamos
17 has become somewhat infamous for security concerns,
18 rightly or wrongly, to some extent at least rightly,
19 I think. It has been regarded as lax on security by
20 a number of authorities to the extent that it was
21 shut down by its own director a couple of years ago
22 for an extended period, at great cost to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 taxpayer.

2 I have tried to call attention to the
3 problem of plutonium accounting at Los Alamos in this
4 article. And I will file the full report, comment,
5 but I would like to give this to you, this article to
6 you, as part of my comments.

7 I have no doubt whatsoever that there is
8 a 300-kilogram discrepancy in plutonium accounting at
9 Los Alamos as it relates to waste. This is not muff.

10 This is not bulk physical inventory differences.
11 This is not unaccounted-for material. This is what
12 Los Alamos claims to have measured, but it has two
13 sets of plutonium books, one which is the national
14 material security account, which is based here in the
15 headquarters, or so I understand, which is the
16 responsibility of the Department of Energy as part of
17 its responsibility to secure nuclear materials.

18 When waste leaves the secure facilities,
19 it becomes part of the waste management organization.

20 That organization at Los Alamos has numbers that are
21 quite different than the security account. The
22 difference is 300 kilograms.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I am convinced by my analysis that no one
2 has refuted, that one of those sets of numbers is
3 wrong with grave environmental implications either
4 for the cleanup at Los Alamos or for the WIPP
5 Program, the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant Program, or
6 there is a chance that some material has been
7 diverted and at least the authorities are not
8 formally aware of it.

9 I think the chances of that might be low,
10 but until a proper accounting of plutonium is done, a
11 300-kilogram plutonium discrepancy is severe. I have
12 not received a clear answer, despite repeated
13 promises that I will ever see assurances in which I
14 have no faith because I received assurances that are
15 on the face of it contrary.

16 The EPA says everything is fine. The
17 NNSA says everything is fine. And both those
18 statements cannot be true. I believe that the
19 scoping of this environmental impact statement,
20 especially as it concerns Los Alamos' signal role in
21 the new complex that is proposed, should do a
22 thorough investigation of this plutonium discrepancy

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 as it concerns environment, as it concerns the WIPP
2 Program, and as it concerns security because I do not
3 believe that this PEIS will be credible or
4 supplemental EIS will be credible without a thorough
5 accounting.

6 I have also called for an independent
7 account. And I shall continue to pursue this matter
8 because it's 60 bombs worth of plutonium. It is six
9 times approximately the plutonium inventory of North
10 Korea, which brings me to to some extent the
11 nonproliferation treaty.

12 I believe that manufacturing new nuclear
13 weapons will compromise the nonproliferation treaty
14 and that there should be an analysis of the increased
15 risks of nuclear explosions in the world if the U.S.
16 embarks down a road continually of do as I say and
17 not as I do.

18 My second point in relation to Los Alamos
19 relates to the site-wide environmental impact
20 statement, which was issued this year in draft form.

21 It shows that plutonium, strontium, and neptunium in
22 surface or ground water, are present in excessive

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 quantities.

2 I have asked the Environmental Protection
3 Agency to revise its standard for transuranic
4 radionuclides for drinking water down by a factor of
5 100 because the science has changed. It has been
6 published by the EPA.

7 The EPA has promised that they will
8 consider this new standard. They have not given us
9 any word on what they will do. They will consider
10 our report that we have sent them as part of their
11 review of radionuclides in drinking water.

12 And I believe that the environmental
13 impact on water in the region should be evaluated
14 according to a standard of 0.15 picocuries per liter
15 alpha-emitting transuranics and not 15 picocuries per
16 liter. And, of course, many of the water supplies in
17 the region as well as storm drain-off in the Los
18 Alamos area are well in excess of the proposed limit.

19 FACILITATOR BROWN: You are at the
20 five-minute mark now. So we have been speaking for
21 five minutes. If you want to make a few more key
22 points? We have one other speaker following you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DR. MAKHIJANI: Sure. Let me make a few
2 key points --

3 FACILITATOR BROWN: That's fine.

4 DR. MAKHIJANI: -- as quickly as I can.

5 Los Alamos also does not have an adequate
6 system of plutonium-238 air, environmental air,
7 monitoring. This has festered for a number of years.

8 Part of the thing that is troubling is
9 not the deficiencies in Los Alamos but the failure of
10 Los Alamos to correct known deficiencies that have
11 been repeatedly pointed out, despite the fact that it
12 claims to have world-class science. It doesn't seem
13 to recognize world-class science on the environmental
14 side. And the laxness on the environmental side
15 indicates that -- as well as on the security side
16 indicates that Los Alamos should not be granted any
17 responsibility for plutonium.

18 And I believe the PEIS should examine an
19 alternative in which a better security environment
20 than Los Alamos can be provided. And it will be
21 sorely deficient if it does not.

22 I believe the PEIS should evaluate cancer

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 incidence according to BEIR VII report and not
2 according to federal guidance report 11. I think the
3 PEIS should evaluate the DOE's own technical
4 performance. And this is the last point I'll make
5 for the moment, and if there is a little more time
6 afterwards, 5:00 o'clock, I might come back if you'll
7 permit me kindly to return to make some more points.

8 One of the most important points I have
9 to make is that this is supposed to be about a
10 reliable replacement warhead. And I believe an
11 analysis of the DOE's performance in the last 20
12 years in major technical projects and its significant
13 failures on technical and financial performance
14 belongs in this EIS because I believe the DOE
15 currently is incapable of manufacturing a reliable
16 replacement warhead because it's, at least to the
17 confidence of anybody, without testing because its
18 technical performance has not been satisfactory. If
19 you believe it has been satisfactory, I believe that
20 needs to be demonstrated.

21 Yucca Mountain, the vitrification at
22 Savannah River site, vitrification plant at Hanford,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the national ignition facility, these are at least
2 projects that should be included in your analysis as
3 well as the DOE access facility at Los Alamos.

4 I believe that the technical problems and
5 the mismanagement of major projects and the
6 management failures of major projects under the
7 Department of Energy in the last 20 years indicates
8 that we may well get a replacement warhead that is
9 regarded widely or at least partly as unreliable.
10 And, therefore, there will be a greater chance of
11 nuclear testing.

12 And, therefore, you should also analyze
13 the environmental and security consequences of
14 nuclear testing in case the warhead proposes not as
15 reliable as you hope it would be.

16 Thank you.

17 FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks very much.

18 Okay. Our next speaker is Arthur Nelson.

19 MSTR. A. NELSON: Hi. I'm Arthur Nelson.

20 And I am 11 years old. And I live in Princeton, New
21 Jersey. And I just have one thing to say. What will
22 the world be like when your children and me are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 grown? What will you leave behind for us?

2 I don't understand why we need so many
3 nuclear weapons. And I don't feel safe with the
4 number we have now. That's all.

5 FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. Thank you.

6 (Applause.)

7 FACILITATOR BROWN: Well, I think I've
8 said this before. I hope you get extra credit in
9 school for that, for your public speaking. Thanks.

10 Is there anyone else in the audience who
11 would like to add anything at this point?

12 (No response.)

13 FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay. Dr. Makhijani,
14 if you would --

15 DR. MAKHIJANI: Just a couple of points.
16 I don't want to take too long.

17 FACILITATOR BROWN: Okay.

18 DR. MAKHIJANI: On a more broad scale,
19 the problem of the nonproliferation treaty in the
20 U.S. record in relation to treaties needs to be
21 considered. I know that it's not normally within the
22 scope of environmental impact statements, but I think

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we are at a very, very critical juncture.

2 The situation of the United States in the
3 world today is critically different than it was five
4 years ago and certainly ten years ago, when it
5 promised the world that it would ratify a
6 comprehensive test ban treaty and eliminate nuclear
7 weapons.

8 I think the -- I am going to submit our
9 newsletter as regards the United States poor
10 performance, certainly not the only country with poor
11 performance, but as the country that gave rise to the
12 whole idea of the rule of law and not of man, which
13 is, I believe, one of the greatest things about this
14 country, which commands not only my deepest respect
15 but has commanded the deepest respect of peoples
16 around the world for more than 200 years, I believe
17 to throw this away in regard to the most important
18 security -- and this is how it would be recorded and
19 viewed around the world.

20 People in this country still debate
21 Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but elsewhere the debate is
22 not so deep. People elsewhere regard Hiroshima and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Nagasaki as the destruction of two cities with atomic
2 weapons. And they know the United States did this,
3 no matter how the people in the United States regard
4 it.

5 And, therefore, they view the United
6 States with some alarm as well as other nuclear-armed
7 countries with the same alarm. Every nuclear-armed
8 country poses different kinds of threats. And
9 terrorists would pose as yet different kinds of
10 threats.

11 To be embarked on a course of promoting
12 reprocessing, as Kevin has said, at the same time to
13 be embarked on a course of perpetual nuclear weapons
14 because Complex 2030 would mean permanent nuclear
15 weapons so far as we can see permanent in political
16 or military terms, which is 1,500 years, that is
17 completely unacceptable because, even if you reduce
18 the arsenal according to the terms of the scope of
19 the EIS, I believe manufacturing new warheads and
20 having a complex that is designed to have nuclear
21 weapons and be responsive to changing circumstances,
22 as you say, means that others should also view

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 nuclear weapons as essential to their own security.

2 This has been an argument that is
3 continuing for the last ten years especially and
4 since the end of the cold war and I think increases
5 the risk of a loss of a city every now and then
6 somewhere in the world, including in this country.
7 And I think that certainly has a human and
8 environmental side that cannot be ignored in this
9 environmental impact statement.

10 And I think perhaps hearing people from
11 some other countries as you scope this thing out as
12 to how they might view an environmental impact
13 process that would create a permanent nuclear weapons
14 establishment in this country contrary to the NPT and
15 the decision of the International Court of Justice
16 advisory decision, no doubt, but still unanimous, my
17 last point relates to workers.

18 It took 50 years for this country and for
19 the Secretary of Energy to stand up in this building
20 and say, "We were wrong. We did expose workers to
21 radiation. We denied that this exposure was" -- I'm
22 paraphrasing, of course. You know that the thrust of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the compensation law was that we didn't admit that
2 these exposures could cause a lot of harm.

3 I do congratulate the Department of
4 Energy in the EIS that it issued about the modern pit
5 facility that the calculation that I did based on the
6 risk coefficients were that several, I believe nine,
7 if I remember the number correctly, workers would die
8 of cancer in a 450-pit facility. I know you are
9 proposing a smaller one.

10 I think you should more frankly and
11 transparently present the calculations of the number
12 of cancer incidence, incidence of cancer, that is
13 expected using the new BEIR VII coefficients.

14 And, finally, I think you should analyze
15 the accidents more frankly. I think the risk
16 analysis as it has been presented in the EISEs that
17 have gone before, like in the chemical and
18 metallurgical building, to simply multiply
19 consequences by the probability of occurrence is
20 unacceptable.

21 You have to describe the consequences of
22 major spills in Los Alamos should they occur or major

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 fires by themselves in terms of the cancer deaths in
2 terms of having to write off a whole town in a
3 beautiful area of the country. Los Alamos has lost
4 to being a nuclear waste dump.

5 You have to examine the risk consciences
6 to security if you say that this is essential for
7 security and is going to be based in Los Alamos of a
8 major spill of plutonium as described in that EIS
9 because it will necessitate perhaps possibly at least
10 the abandonment of Los Alamos if it becomes so
11 contaminated that radiation doses are as projected by
12 the Department of Energy.

13 I think the consequences of accidents and
14 fires have not been adequately explored in the past.

15 And I hope that you will make them a more thorough
16 and clear part of the scope of the document which you
17 are proposing.

18 Thank you.

19 FACILITATOR BROWN: Thanks very much.

20 Well, that concludes the number of folks
21 who have signed up. And, again, we are scheduled to
22 remain here until 5:00, but we will take a recess.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And if anybody does arrive to speak, we will
2 reconvene. So thanks very much.

3 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
4 the record at 4:42 p.m. and went back on the record
5 at 4:59 p.m.)

6 MR. KAMPS: My name is Kevin Kamps with
7 Nuclear Information and Resource Service. And the
8 point I wanted to add had to do with radioactive
9 waste needing to be a part of the scoping process.

10 At least in terms of the tritium
11 generation that would be a part of this program and
12 perhaps in other ways as well, there seems to be an
13 association between this proposal and the generation
14 of yet more irradiated nuclear fuel in the United
15 States.

16 And I think with the Yucca Mountain
17 project being in such disarray, that the lack of
18 confidence in radioactive waste management in the
19 coming decades and beyond is a huge issue that needs
20 to be addressed. And that should very much be a part
21 of this proposal.

22 There seems to be no good solution for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 irradiation nuclear fuel, whether it be commercial
2 waste or Department of Energy-generated materials.
3 And so that needs to be looked at very carefully.

4 The site that generates that waste will
5 likely be the site that has to store it for an
6 indefinite period into the future. And there are
7 safety and security implications to that.

8 There are a lot of safety concerns with
9 waste storage in this country in terms of accident
10 potential. In terms of security, there is the
11 potential of sabotage or terrorist attack against
12 these stored wastes and the possibility, whether by
13 accident or attack, of catastrophic radiation
14 releases. So the waste issue needs to be addressed
15 as a part of this.

16 MODERATOR WYKA: Thank you, Kevin.

17 MR. KAMPS: Thank you.

18 MODERATOR WYKA: Off the record.

19 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
20 the record at 5:00 p.m. and went back on the record
21 at 5:01 p.m.)

22 DR. MAKHIJANI: I am Arjun Makhijani. I

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 just briefly wanted to make a comment, not about the
2 scoping itself but about the process. I deeply
3 appreciate the Department of Energy remains open,
4 even at its headquarters, in these times to take
5 comments from the public. This is very important.

6 The democratic values that that
7 represents are a wonderful hallmark of this country.

8 And I think I just want to be on the record as
9 commending the Department of Energy for the open
10 process here in Washington, which I witnessed
11 personally.

12 And I hope that the comments that have
13 been made as they are relevant to the scoping process
14 will actually be incorporated in the scoping and it
15 will see an environmental impact statement that in
16 substance will reflect the very good process that you
17 have had here. And I look forward to that.

18 Thank you.

19 MODERATOR WYKA: Thank you, sir.

20 DR. MAKHIJANI: No. Thank you very much.

21 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter went off
22 the record at 5:02 p.m. and went back on the record

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 at 5:03 p.m.)

2 FACILITATOR BROWN: The hour of 5:00
3 o'clock has arrived. And I am reconvening the
4 meeting and asking if there are any remaining members
5 of the public who would like to make a statement and
6 observing that no members of the public express such
7 an interest.

8 We are officially adjourned. Thanks very
9 much.

10 (Whereupon, the foregoing matter was
11 concluded at 5:04 p.m.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701