

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

COMPLEX 2030  
SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMMATIC  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT  
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING  
National Nuclear Security Administration  
Department of Energy

DECEMBER 4, 2006  
6:30 p.m.  
Macey Center, New Mexico Tech  
801 Leroy Place  
Socorro, New Mexico

REPORTED BY: Beverly Ann Schlei mer, RDR, CCR #66  
Bean & Associates, Inc.  
Professional Court Reporting Service  
500 Marquette, Northwest, Suite 280  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

JOB NO. : 2495A BEV

1  
2

(7:45 p.m.)

DR. LAWSON: Okay, great, as you're getting

3 back to your seats, I will start reading comments  
4 into the formal record.

5 This portion of our meeting is officially  
6 designated as the Socorro, New Mexico, public meeting  
7 for the National Nuclear Security Administration's  
8 Supplemental PEIS for the Complex 2030 program.

9 This meeting is being held on December 4,  
10 2006, in the Macey Center on the New Mexico Tech  
11 campus. It's being held to receive comments on the  
12 scope of this PEIS. We are commencing the public  
13 comment portion of this meeting at 7:45, and we're  
14 scheduled to adjourn once all participants have had a  
15 chance to make their comments, or 10:00 o'clock,  
16 whichever is later.

17 Each speaker will have a maximum of five  
18 minutes, with provisions as I indicated earlier if  
19 you need to speak after other people have spoken.

20 This meeting was preceded by a presentation  
21 by NNSA EIS document manager, Mr. Ted Wyka. Mr. Wyka  
22 seated to my right will represent the Administration  
23 in listening to and accepting your comments.

24 Also, for the record, my name is Barry  
25 Lawson of Barry Lawson Associates. I've been asked

3

1 by the NNSA to conduct this comment period as an  
2 independent and neutral moderator. I will assure  
3 that the ground rules that I reviewed earlier in the  
4 evening are followed. This approach is in keeping  
5 with both the spirit and the letter of the National  
6 Environmental Policy Act.

7 Our court reporter this evening is Beverly  
Page 2

8 Schleimer, and her task is to create a complete and  
9 accurate description of this meeting. The verbatim  
10 transcript of oral comments received tonight will be  
11 included in NNSA's record of these proceedings, and  
12 they will place copies of the transcript from this  
13 and other public meetings in its Freedom of  
14 Information Act designated reading rooms as soon as  
15 practical.

16 If you wish to make oral comments tonight,  
17 as I mentioned earlier, I would appreciate it if you  
18 have first signed up at the registration table, and I  
19 will recognize speakers in the order in which they  
20 have registered.

21 Please remain in this area if you are  
22 scheduled to speak. I will be calling two speakers  
23 at a time, the current, and the on-deck speaker, so  
24 that you will have some warning before you have to  
25 speak.

4

1 When it is your turn, please come forward  
2 to this podium to my right. This will help the court  
3 reporter make an accurate record of your comments.

4 If you are approaching the time limit, I  
5 will as gracefully as possible let you know that and  
6 give you a signal, and ask you to be as graceful as  
7 possible in finishing up your comments within the  
8 time period.

9 If we do have a lot of other comments that  
10 have to be made, it's in my discretion to call for a  
11 recess, if necessary, during the evening.

12 Commenters are asked by the court reporter  
13 to please state your name, and if you have a written  
14 copy of your testimony, or if you have a written  
15 document that you would like to submit as an exhibit  
16 to your comments, please bring it to me after you  
17 have spoken.

18 As mentioned several times earlier, written  
19 materials will be formally accepted in the record,  
20 and in addition to your oral comments, and will be  
21 weighed equally by NNSA.

22 So, with that under our belt, we can go on  
23 to the list of speakers, and the first speaker that I  
24 have this evening is Greg Mello. Mr. Mello will be  
25 followed by Dave Wheelock.

5

1 MR. MELLO: Thank you, Barry, thank you for  
2 this opportunity to speak.

3 I would like to acknowledge all of the NNSA  
4 and contractor people who are here this evening,  
5 you've traveled a long way, and who, I hope, will  
6 despite the unpleasantness of the messages that you  
7 are likely to get here in New Mexico, will try to  
8 extract from our speech something of value. We  
9 aren't all as eloquent as we would like to be. So,  
10 open your hearts if you can, even if you're tired,  
11 and we will do our best.

12 I want to do something a little different  
13 tonight than I would normally do and have done for  
14 many years at meetings like this.

15 I guess, Brian Cosner may remember that we  
16 were flown to Washington once by DOE to advise them

17 in about 1995 on how to conduct site wide, that's a  
18 programmatic environmental impact statements. We met  
19 in some hotel on K Street. I can't remember where  
20 that was. Anyways, we've been down the NEPA road for  
21 a very long time.

22 This, the public -- I want to make remarks  
23 to three groups of people, the NNSA folks, the feds  
24 and their contractors, citizens, and to my colleagues  
25 in other NTO organizations tonight.

6

1 I will put written comments in on the site  
2 wide environmental impact statements, but -- I didn't  
3 mean to say site wide.

4 DR. LAWSON: Gotcha.

5 MR. MELLO: The supplement, and we just had  
6 that. And if these comments are too -- are  
7 considered not germane enough, then you will have to  
8 arrest me. So I'll save the technical comments for  
9 those written comments. This is a precious  
10 opportunity to talk to officials face-to-face, as  
11 well as to citizens.

12 We are meeting at a time when it seems to  
13 me that the social and political consensus supporting  
14 nuclear weapons is collapsing. No one likes weapons  
15 of mass destruction any more. And this is at the  
16 root of a lot of management problems that exist  
17 across the nuclear warhead complex. It's at the root  
18 of congressional criticisms in the -- especially the  
19 House Appropriations Committee. It's at the root of  
20 concerns about cost and effectiveness that are in the

21 Secretary of Energy's Advisory Board Task Force  
22 Committee on the future of the nuclear weapons  
23 complex.

24 I think it's fair to say that the Complex  
25 2030 plan is in response to congressional criticism

7

1 of the status quo which the Secretary of Energy's  
2 Advisory Board has set, is not technically credible  
3 or feasible. I don't have the exact quote in front  
4 of me, but -- so, in the words of Paul -- of John  
5 Richards' comments, perhaps Los Alamos' most  
6 celebrated retired weapons examiner, it took him a  
7 long time to realize this, he said, but the customer  
8 doesn't want the product any more. That's the  
9 management problem that you and NNSA are faced with,  
10 and that's why we are talking about consolidation.

11 Now, if consolidation isn't -- includes new  
12 facilities, which it must, a new -- if we could --  
13 this enterprise needs a fresh injection of political  
14 legitimacy to maintain morale, to -- as I think the  
15 slogan of this 20 -- Complex 2030 program, may be  
16 getting the job done. The job is not getting done  
17 across the complex, and I think that we don't want to  
18 get the job done. That is why many of us are here  
19 this evening, and what -- so the question of how to  
20 perpetuate the nuclear weapons complex, is the wrong  
21 question. The question is how really -- in many of  
22 our minds, how to bring it to a graceful end.

23 Now, we have transcendent -- well, I'll go  
24 back to that in a second.

25 So the first -- after those remarks, I just

1 want to say something to our NNSA contractor  
2 colleagues, there are moral and legal issues related  
3 to pursuing the continuance of the nuclear weapons  
4 enterprise at this time.

5           Now, it's -- for some of us, it's our  
6 professional responsibility to understand these and  
7 articulate them and communicate them to others. And  
8 you'll hear a better explanation of this from me  
9 later this week.

10           But I hope you will come to -- over --  
11 while you're in Los Alamos, to our disarmament  
12 center, and there you can pick up written material  
13 that'll be just on point.

14           But the fact is that the United States has  
15 an obligation to nuclear disarmament, to complete  
16 nuclear disarmament. It's been adjudicated in the  
17 International Court of Justice. It's not a matter of  
18 contention any more. The United States does not  
19 defend its resistance to fulfilling its obligations  
20 under the nuclear nonproliferation treaty any more in  
21 international gatherings. It's just news to the  
22 managers of the weapons complex probably, and the  
23 contractors. And it is somehow a thing which we  
24 can't discuss in polite society in the United States.

25           This is something that we all must try to

1 understand together. And I will go down that road  
2 with any of you personally, I will take time to do

3 it, a lot has been written, and we are -- if we  
4 don't, we risk being engaged in a weapon -- Nuremberg  
5 Tribunals, as I recall, called inchoate crimes, where  
6 we give over our work to others, and empower them to  
7 use weapons of mass destruction. We can be involved  
8 in a war crime, even if we don't consciously have  
9 that intention in our own mind.

10           That in a way is the genius of the  
11 Manhattan project, and the system that has rolled  
12 down to the present time. But through educating  
13 ourselves, becoming more conscious of this, we can  
14 overcome this basic -- this problem. There's a lot  
15 of references you've heard in the initial talk to  
16 authority, that this is our responsibility, and we  
17 are given this charge, or I wasn't paying close  
18 attention, I have heard it a lot. That authority is  
19 illegitimate if it involves planning and threatening  
20 with weapons of mass destruction. And no one is  
21 under any obligation to follow it.

22           In fact, even military people are under a  
23 positive obligation to ignore it.

24           That was one of the key findings of the  
25 Nuremberg Tribunal. And I hope -- I see one

10

1 gentleman in uniform here this evening. We can't  
2 allow ourselves to lose the democratic foundations of  
3 our society based on what boils down to contractor  
4 greed.

5           To the citizens who are here, the second  
6 group, I would like to say, again, this is not the  
7 right forum. Don't vest your hopes in the NEPA

8 process. Those hopes will be dashed. We live in a  
9 time of declining democracy, and really of a broader  
10 cultural decline that keeps me up at night.

11 We have to discover ways to self-organize  
12 ourselves to form groups that are internally loyal  
13 and devoted to discovering what is true, and to  
14 supporting one another in the resistance in the  
15 political activities that can save our planet and  
16 save the people on it.

17 We are faced with exigent crises that  
18 threaten the entire planet, and a lot of people on  
19 it.

20 And the maturity of our generation is going  
21 to be evaluated by history and our own characters in  
22 how we responded to that crisis. Did we do enough?  
23 Are we going to just drift? We have to change our  
24 lives, the minimum quantity, the minimum quantum of  
25 political effectiveness is our own life, it's our own

11

1 self.

2 But with that we have to change our  
3 relationships. We have to decide not -- you know, a  
4 lot of people ask me, well, what can I do? Usually  
5 what they mean is, what can I do that will only take  
6 a few minutes? That's not a good question. The  
7 answer -- you want to change the question. What can  
8 I do that will really be effective?

9 I think it was Eleanor Roosevelt who said,  
10 "There are times when doing your best is not enough."  
11 And I think we have to get used to that, because

12 that's the kind of time we live in.

13           There are some relatively simple things to  
14 do, and I just -- you know what they are. A lot of  
15 them are the tried and true basics. You need to go  
16 down and talk to Senator Bingaman's staff members,  
17 you need to know their birthdays, you need to --  
18 don't write a letter -- just write, that's fine,  
19 write a letter, okay. But that's mostly just for us.  
20 That makes us feel good. What will change that man's  
21 mind?

22           Now, one of the reasons I think this is the  
23 wrong forum, is that this process deals with  
24 decisions that are going to happen in late 2008, and  
25 really will be implemented over a longer period of

12

1 time after that.

2           Those decisions will be substantially  
3 prejudiced by -- first, by the question of whether  
4 the chemistry metallurgy research replacement  
5 facility is built at Los Alamos National Laboratory  
6 right now. That's a billion-dollar plutonium  
7 facility. It's a production annex, you might call  
8 it. It consists of two buildings.

9           In order for that building to be effective  
10 and to work, there will have to be another billion  
11 dollars, according to the nuclear -- excuse me, the  
12 Defense Nuclear Facility Safety Board, another  
13 \$1 billion in investment in nuclear infrastructure at  
14 Los Alamos, with \$2 billion in investment in  
15 plutonium production at Los Alamos. It's a long way  
16 toward determining the outcome of this -- of the

17 process that we are engaged in tonight.

18           The most politically incendiary part of  
19 this decision is where to locate the plutonium -- the  
20 consolidated plutonium center.

21           DR. LAWSON: Excuse me, I'm not going cut  
22 you off, but --

23           MR. MELLO: I'm getting close.

24           DR. LAWSON: Okay, good.

25           MR. MELLO: Thank you.

13

1           The second thing that is happening right  
2 now is that it's very easy to gloss over the fact  
3 that the United States is about to start up the  
4 manufacture of nuclear warheads again, after what  
5 would be a halt of 18 years.

6           It would be wrong to say, and I think you  
7 know, if we just read the environment statements, we  
8 get this idea, that we are going to increase  
9 production from 20 to 80 at Los Alamos. That's not  
10 right. That's wrong. We are going to increase  
11 production from zero to something. That production  
12 hasn't begun yet, and it will be a major milestone, a  
13 major policy change if it happens, and we can be sure  
14 that Kim Jong Il and Mr. Ahmadi nejad -- I got that  
15 right -- will tell us about that.

16           If you go to Geneva, if you go to New York,  
17 you talk to diplomats, you know they know what  
18 happens here. They watch. And we are empowering  
19 proliferators by these decisions. We are diminishing  
20 our security.

21 Finally, to -- just briefly, I know I'm  
22 taking up too much time -- to my colleagues in other  
23 NGOs, let's not hold back. Let's -- we've got a big  
24 opportunity. We -- things which seem politically  
25 impossible, I think will become common sense to more

14

1 and more people. Let's -- in our -- for those in  
2 NNSA, you might find this interesting. Our field is  
3 ripping into, you might say, or many, by -- there are  
4 those who are in the arms control world who would  
5 like to control nuclear weapons, prevent anything  
6 irrational from happening. And then there are those  
7 who would like to get rid of nuclear weapons, and  
8 pursuant to treaty.

9 One is the nuclear disarmament requirements  
10 of the treaties that the United States have signed,  
11 need to be brought up and made front and center.  
12 That is the value-based approach, that's compatible  
13 with the security paradigm. We need to take into the  
14 21st century, which we can build the alliances that  
15 will help us with global warming, that will help us  
16 in valuing life as really hundreds of millions of  
17 people are threatened right now by a lot of things  
18 which you can say as well as I.

19 Let's not -- nuclear weapons have not been  
20 accepted in this society, as polls show. Let's not  
21 accept them.

22 Thank you for your patience. That's it.

23 DR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Mello. Thank  
24 you. I appreciate your talk. I will also remind  
25 you, if you are going to take longer than the five

1 minutes, if you would let me know, because we have  
2 some people here who I suspect thought they were  
3 going to speak and be out of here, and if they have  
4 to wait until 10:00 o'clock, they may get angry with  
5 me for not keeping to the -- I really don't like to  
6 interrupt anybody when they are on a roll in giving a  
7 nice presentation, and that's why I didn't interrupt  
8 this.

9           But if you do think you are going to need  
10 more time, please try to let me know ahead of time.

11           Our next speaker is Dave Wheelock. He will  
12 be followed by Joan Truesdell.

13           MR. WHEELOCK: Thank you. It's an honor,  
14 an unexpected honor to speak after you, Greg Mello.  
15 Thank you.

16           And my presentation will be well under five  
17 minutes, I'm quite sure, unless I get interrupted.  
18 But my -- something that you said, Greg, before the  
19 meeting struck a nerve with me, when you started  
20 talking democratic institutions, and how we are  
21 losing our knack for those types of institutions,  
22 because I couldn't agree more.

23           I write a biweekly column. Usually the  
24 subject, in one way or another, is related to  
25 democracy.

1           Just briefly, my remarks are probably more  
2 along the lines of questions than they are anything

3 else.

4 My questions are pretty basic, but I think  
5 that they address the subject of democracy more than  
6 anything else.

7 First of all, I noticed on alternative 3 at  
8 the bottom, the point would be -- one of the  
9 drawbacks of alternative 3, as stated in this  
10 document, is that they would not have a production  
11 capacity sufficient to meet current national security  
12 objectives.

13 Right there, that's -- the alarm bell went  
14 off in my mind is in a democracy it seems like we  
15 would have a little bit more say as citizens as to  
16 what are our current national security objectives.  
17 These are basic things that just -- these phrases  
18 just appear, and they just go right past -- they go  
19 kind of in one ear and out the other, yeah, you know,  
20 national security objectives. We never stop to give  
21 any thought as to how much influence did I have on  
22 setting national security objectives?

23 And, then, in considering this forum here  
24 tonight, the first thing that I wondered is how much  
25 weight will our comments really have? And I know

17

1 that neither Mr. Mello or myself have probably even  
2 once touched upon the kind of input that you're  
3 actually soliciting here, which is along these  
4 limited lines of alternative 1, 2 or 3. We're not  
5 really speaking to those, but you probably find a lot  
6 of people that will do this, we don't really feel  
7 like we have an effective voice and/or an opportunity

8 to speak like this.

9 And, so, when we are given a chance to talk  
10 about three narrow alternatives, it kind of boils  
11 over into something else. We want to talk about  
12 broader issues. The regulatory process, number one,  
13 is problematic.

14 First of all, how much weight will our  
15 words have here tonight? Where do all of these  
16 comments end up? Who is going to look at them? How  
17 are they going to evaluate them? How many of them  
18 are just going to be thrown out as the word of the  
19 people who are -- to quote the phrase, the term,  
20 "unreasonable" or "reasonable," written right on the  
21 board here, "We are looking for reasonable  
22 objectives." But there's -- this is the buzz word.  
23 No one defines what reasonable is, and what  
24 reasonable is not. These are the kind of questions  
25 that we want to ask.

18

1 We know from history, recent history, of  
2 the Robles, the so-called Robles Rule, where public  
3 input was taken around the country overwhelmingly in  
4 support of leaving Robles areas that way. It was  
5 overturned by the administration, by the current  
6 administration. We know this. We are not stupid  
7 over here in New Mexico.

8 And, so, we have to bring these questions  
9 up at forums like this.

10 And then the last thing, in closing, I just  
11 wonder if I'm the only one in the room who doesn't

12 have just a slight suspicion that alternative number  
13 2 has already been chosen.

14 Thank you very much.

15 DR. LAWSON: Thank you.

16 Our next speaker is Joan Truesdell, to be  
17 followed by Rich Urie.

18 MS. TRUESDELL: What I want to address is,  
19 we are looking for more informed and better decisions  
20 for the transformation of the nuclear weapons complex  
21 to meet national security.

22 And, so, right away, again, talking about  
23 buzz words, what I am interested in is security. I'm  
24 interested in the security of Socorro. I'm  
25 interested in the security of New Mexico. I'm

19

1 interested in the security of the world. I'm  
2 interested in the security of the planet. And I'm  
3 here to say that the nuclear weapons complex does not  
4 contribute to that security of those places.

5 Some of what I'm going to say is -- I'm  
6 going to read, and I've read it in places, but I mean  
7 it from my heart. This is a chance for me to have a  
8 voice. Oh, thank you, so, I don't have to stand on  
9 my toes. Good one.

10 So, it might be boring to hear some of what  
11 I'm saying, but it's very important for me to be here  
12 and to have a voice, so that I can try to sleep at  
13 night when I worry about security.

14 Okay -- excuse me -- to me, to have  
15 security, I would like the government to -- and  
16 society at large -- to invest in human and -- pardon

17 me, for reading here. I would like them to invest in  
18 human and environmental security, not in preparations  
19 for war, which is how I see building more -- building  
20 nuclear weapons, again, after not building them for  
21 18 years.

22 What I value is peace, justice, uplifting  
23 the morals of society, following the law, and  
24 environmental sustainability. And I don't feel that  
25 this project goes in that direction at all. It goes

20

1 against that.

2 Another summary -- I'm just hitting  
3 different things here. I'm skipping to the next  
4 one -- I'm going on to the next one.

5 We have -- we have spread -- the United  
6 States ratified in 1970, the nuclear  
7 nonproliferation -- you know what I mean -- treaty.  
8 And under that treaty, we have binding obligations to  
9 achieve nuclear disarmament. So we would be  
10 violating that treaty living -- trying to act outside  
11 of the law. And what we're telling other countries  
12 to follow the law. So not only are we breaking the  
13 law, but we are also being a role model for the  
14 people who we like to call terrorists. When they do  
15 it they're terrorists and we blame them. So why can  
16 we do it? It doesn't make sense to me. And I think  
17 it's wrong, morally wrong and illegal.

18 Okay. And I want to say something that --  
19 I believe a point Greg made that -- I'm reading here  
20 in the Sun Monthly, November 2006, and it's available

21 in the back there, on the Los Alamos study group  
22 table.

23 And I will read the quote, "Polls show  
24 there is no support for anything but a declining  
25 nuclear weapons enterprise headed for mutual

21

1 disarmament pursuant to treaties already signed and  
2 ratified."

3 So not only is there law -- a treaty that  
4 we are bound to legally, but I believe that it is  
5 supported by people in this country.

6 Okay. Now, we are talking about  
7 national -- well, let's see, wait, let me find it. I  
8 can't find my note. But basically there is some  
9 phrase that we use, nuclear -- I'm sorry, national  
10 security. And what it really is is a nuclear policy,  
11 it's not a national security policy. It's not about  
12 security. It's a nuclear policy.

13 And, so, we are doing this with some kind  
14 of logic that I don't follow, that it is for defense.

15 But, again -- pardon me for reading -- "in  
16 fact, it justifies -- doing this justifies in many  
17 eyes the acquisition of similar weapons by others."  
18 Kind of something I said before, but I want to repeat  
19 it, because I think it's real important.

20 So the U.S. violation -- the violation by  
21 the United States of disarmament obligations  
22 undercuts efforts to control proliferation, which we  
23 are trying to control, which we say we believe in.

24 And as we are building -- as we are  
25 violating, as we are not disarming, as we said we

1 would, it leads to war, including nuclear war.

2           And, so, this thing that I keep saying,  
3 national security policy, to me it's a nuclear policy  
4 and it's about imperialism, and it's being enforced  
5 by the nuclear military, and that's really why I'm  
6 here tonight speaking.

7           Another point. We already have nuclear  
8 weapons, and in New Mexico we have more nuclear  
9 weapons stored at Kirtland than in any other state of  
10 the country, and as a matter of fact, than anywhere  
11 else in the world. So why are we building more?

12           Another -- sometimes I hear, okay, this is  
13 for economic development for our state. We're a poor  
14 state, we need the economic development. Well,  
15 again, excuse me for reading -- "New Mexico is the  
16 home to the two best funded nuclear weapons  
17 facilities in the world, Los Alamos and Sandia."  
18 There's a 60-year history of getting federal funding  
19 for these nuclear weapon facilities, and yet in 2003,  
20 Borden University found that the state of New Mexico  
21 is very low -- okay -- I've got another note, I  
22 think.

23           So, instead of contributing to the economic  
24 development of our state of New Mexico, this 2003  
25 Borden study found that New Mexico is one of the

1 lowest of all of the states in terms of -- will come  
2 out low because of poverty, low health insurance

3 coverage, teenage drug abuse, low average weekly  
4 wages, suicide, and no high school completion.

5 So we don't have much to show for it if  
6 we're doing it for economic development.

7 Okay. Now, another point I would like to  
8 point out is that the principal production site at  
9 Rocky Flats Colorado was closed. And it was closed  
10 for a reason. Two very good friends of mine, a  
11 Leonor and Hans Gottlieb, used to spend many hours in  
12 the cold protesting at that site, and they finally  
13 won. It was closed. They're dead now.

14 And, so, why do we want to start that here  
15 in New Mexico? The groundwater around Rocky Flats is  
16 polluted, not to mention all the other -- the  
17 clean-up that, you know, they've done some, but it  
18 just can't be done.

19 We don't know what to do with nuclear  
20 waste. And other states have rejected this new  
21 project. So I want New Mexico to join in that  
22 rejection. Not here, not in my backyard.

23 And, again, there's no place to dump  
24 nuclear stuff. When WIPP went through to supposedly  
25 a safe place to dump nuclear stuff, it was promised

24

1 to be low-grade stuff. What just happened about a  
2 month ago? They changed that. I didn't hear any  
3 public hearings about that. And now it's taking  
4 hotter stuff.

5 And, so, I don't want New Mexico to be a  
6 dumping ground for nuclear stuff, where it's not  
7 being made, they're polluting, and will create more

8 of a problem.

9 DR. LAWSON: Ms. Truesdell, how much time  
10 would you like?

11 MS. TRUESDELL: I think I'm about done.

12 DR. LAWSON: Okay.

13 MS. TRUESDELL: So, yeah, to wrap up, what  
14 I am standing here to say is that I'm for disarmament  
15 pursuant to the treaty, and I do not support pit  
16 production anywhere, and particularly in New Mexico  
17 where I live.

18 Thank you.

19 DR. LAWSON: Thank you, very much.

20 The next speaker is Rich Urie, to be  
21 followed by Michael Hanauer.

22 MR. URIE: Thank you. Good evening, ladies  
23 and gentlemen. I didn't plan to be here this  
24 evening. I'm really here by happenstance. And I  
25 don't intend on debating policy, although I have

25

1 great respect for those of you that do.

2 I'm here to make a -- to provide some  
3 insight and make a specific request to DOE.

4 First, let me give you some perspective.  
5 I'm board certified in safety and industrial hygiene.  
6 I provided safety services from Jakarta to Germany,  
7 up in the Arctic, and last year I was in Baghdad on a  
8 volunteer mission to support the Army.

9 I've worked at Hanford, Rocky Flats. I've  
10 been at Lawrence Livermore, and recently I spent five  
11 years at the Los Alamos National Laboratory.

12 I find my experience at Los Alamos was a  
13 bit disturbing. I worked on environmental  
14 restoration, I did training, and I also provided  
15 waste management safety support services.

16 My most recent gig at Los Alamos was I was  
17 a team leader for a 40-member team that would deploy  
18 throughout the country doing biological weapons  
19 monitoring for the FBI and Secret Service. There was  
20 nothing classified about what I'm saying here. It's  
21 part of the Fire Watch Program.

22 I found, though, in my last couple of years  
23 there, that you -- and by the way, I worked with some  
24 of the smartest, finest people at Los Alamos. I have  
25 great respect for the skill levels and the integrity

26

1 of many of those people, some of the finest I've  
2 worked with in the world. But there is a culture  
3 there that's problematic. And that I had hoped with  
4 the transition of the contract that that would go  
5 away. I don't believe it has. I refer to it as  
6 managerial inbreeding, if you will.

7 There are certain avenues of management  
8 that is very -- in my opinion, very self-serving.

9 I brought to light some problems over a  
10 period of months, requesting safety standards,  
11 requesting intervention for fundamental safety,  
12 equipment from my team. And it was ignored, and it  
13 was ignored and it was ignored. It made its way, I  
14 believe, to Pete Nanos, the director, and they fixed  
15 it. It reached the right level. It was corrected  
16 quickly.

17                   But as a result of that, you know, I found  
18 myself kind of shoved off in the corner, not given  
19 assignments, et cetera. I will spare you the  
20 details. I decided to leave. And I paid a bit of a  
21 price for that, as did my family.

22                   The message I would like to bring -- and  
23 incidentally, I brought these issues to bear to NNSA,  
24 and to their credit, they took them seriously, and  
25 they required Los Alamos to do an investigation,

27

1    which they are now doing. But the point being, they  
2    still are able to work in a vacuum. It's very  
3    difficult to get third-party intervention and  
4    attention, for even baseline needs, in some cases.  
5    Some areas very much overkill in health and safety.  
6    They read things by the letter of law. Other areas,  
7    it's almost like you're working for a different  
8    institution, and I find that very concerning. And I  
9    find the thought of awarding Los Alamos in  
10   particular, a huge additional responsibility without  
11   additional accountability to be very concerning and  
12   very troublesome.

13                   I think I would request that NNSA take a  
14 look at that there are no contractual loopholes,  
15 which I ran into. Los Alamos gets to do  
16 investigation, not DOE. I'm not talking about me,  
17 I'm talking about the picture stuff here.

18                   There needs to be some means of evaluating  
19 what's going on internally and stepping in and  
20 correcting it. I believe DOE tries to do that. I

21 believe they are also shut out, and there's a price  
22 to pay for questioning the authority at Los Alamos.

23 Thank you.

24 DR. LAWSON: Thank you very much.

25 Our next speaker is Michael Hanauer, to be

28

1 followed by Scott Kovac.

2 MR. HANAUER: So I'm going to be incredibly  
3 brief, I think. I'm Michael Hanauer. I am a small  
4 business owner here in Socorro, I'm a father, I'm a  
5 patriot. I believe in America. I also believe  
6 building new nuclear weapons is the wrong direction.  
7 Total worldwide reduction and elimination, I think,  
8 is the direction that is needed. I think that takes  
9 cooperation. I think that talks -- those are talks  
10 with our allies, those are talks with people we call  
11 the evil axis. Those are people we don't even agree  
12 with. We need to be talking to more people on a  
13 foreign-policy level instead of ignoring them. I  
14 feel that if they have the chance to do things on  
15 their own, I don't think that's going to be a good  
16 policy.

17 I feel military action and power alone is  
18 not making us safer here in America. Less military,  
19 I believe, is actually the direction that we need to  
20 go. Over the last several years, our build-up has  
21 been the direction that we've gone. I think this is  
22 the wrong direction.

23 Let us change our foreign policies, and I  
24 feel our foreign policies are actually intermixed  
25 with our energy policies.

1           Let's begin -- if going to keep them  
2 together, let's keep them together, but let's be more  
3 sensible in what we do. Let's not chase the last bit  
4 of oil that's out there. We're not there yet. But  
5 are we actually going to start in that direction? If  
6 we do, what does that create? Yeah, we're going to  
7 get the last bit of oil or close to it. But it will  
8 cost us. It's going to cost the world. Is this  
9 really a direction we all want to go?

10           I would like to suggest another direction.  
11 This isn't my idea, I read this. It's out there,  
12 it's other people are talking about it. But we have  
13 an opportunity to be a real leader, a real country  
14 with real leadership. I feel what that involves is  
15 becoming the leader that we are capable of being.  
16 We're a superpower. We're supposed to be the last of  
17 the superpowers.

18           My attitude is let's take that  
19 intelligence, that economic, that political, the  
20 military might that we really have, let's apply it,  
21 let's really do something with it, that is instead of  
22 a direction taking us in and ending, let's take it  
23 into a new beginning.

24           Let's talk about energy. We won't need  
25 military if there's an abundance of energy, because

1 it's resources is why -- or lack of resources is why  
2 we need military. Ah, there's a few other reasons we

3 need it, but this one is a big one.

4           If we had the vision, because we have the  
5 power, but if we had the vision to create a renewable  
6 energy resource, and it's within our technology,  
7 maybe not today, but in 10 years, if we united as a  
8 country, regardless of what we all believe in, it  
9 would be something that we can unite behind and do  
10 together, create the renewable energy resources, we  
11 wouldn't need as much military might. We need some,  
12 but wouldn't need as much. We could unite our  
13 country, we could lower the military needs worldwide,  
14 we could increase the prosperity in the world, we  
15 could improve our environment, we could address  
16 global warming, simply because hydrocarbons aren't  
17 being burned as much.

18           So, in conclusion, using nuclear weapons, I  
19 believe, is based on a fear policy. I think we  
20 should address fear. 9/11 made us react. It was a  
21 knee-jerk reaction. It's got us in -- what do they  
22 call it -- the quagmire now? I mean, we've got a big  
23 problem going on. I don't know who's going to solve  
24 this. But it's on our shoulders. It doesn't matter  
25 what party we're in. We're all in the boat together,

31

1 we've got to figure it out. We will. It's going to  
2 cost us.

3           What I'm saying is we have the power to be  
4 a true world leader. Weapons won't keep us safe.  
5 Maybe diplomacy is a new direction that we need to  
6 do. And we need to talk to our enemies, as well as  
7 our partners, as well as our friends.

8 I don't think that's just being optimistic,  
9 I think it is a new direction for this century.

10 Thank you.

11 DR. LAWSON: Thank you very much, Mr.  
12 Hanauer.

13 Our next speaker is Scott Kovac, and he  
14 will be followed by Astrid Webster.

15 MR. KOVAC: Thank you, Mr. Wyka, it's nice  
16 to meet you.

17 I request that the following issues be  
18 included in the scope of public review for the  
19 Complex 2030 Supplemental Programmatic Environmental  
20 Impact Statement.

21 Among the given alternatives, DOE only  
22 offers choices between varying degrees of nuclear  
23 weapons production. An enhanced global security  
24 alternative must also be included, because in  
25 essence, it's responsible custodianship of nuclear

32

1 weapons, while they await dismantling under the  
2 framework of the 1970 nonproliferation treaty.

3 Recently released studies say that  
4 plutonium pits, the core of nuclear weapons, have  
5 lifetimes of 100 years. The oldest weapons in the  
6 planned stockpile are 28 years old, and, therefore,  
7 have 70 years of life remaining. Please explain what  
8 is the true need for new designed nuclear weapons and  
9 production?

10 This gets me to another question that I  
11 would like to have you address in the draft

12 supplemental EIS, and that is, in all of your fact  
13 sheets back there, you don't once mention the  
14 reliable replacement overhead. And it's very  
15 confusing for us to know if, in fact, the Complex  
16 2030 site-wide environmental impact statement is for  
17 the existing stockpile or if it's for new design  
18 nuclear weapons.

19 Please analyze the impacts, diverting  
20 taxpayer dollars to new nuclear weapons facilities  
21 instead of cleaning up the massive environmental  
22 damage caused by past research and production.

23 What are the long-term public health and  
24 ecological effects of leaving radioactive and  
25 chemical contaminants that make polluted precious

33

1 water resources, while new, unnecessary, and costly  
2 nuclear facilities are being built.

3 Please provide a rigorous cost analysis  
4 that should verify or not DOE's claim that Complex  
5 2030 will save the taxpayer dollars.

6 As per a recent federal court decision, the  
7 adverse consequences of potential terrorist attacks  
8 at DOE nuclear facilities must be analyzed, please.

9 Because of its likely size and complexity,  
10 the public comment period for the draft Complex 2030  
11 site-wide environmental statement should far exceed  
12 the minimum requirement of 45 days. I request at  
13 least 120 days. Because upon the release of the  
14 draft DOE -- upon the release draft, DOE should make  
15 also cited reference documents immediately available  
16 on the Internet.

17                   One more thing. The site-wide  
18 environmental impact statement will involve possibly  
19 the D&D or the demolition and destruction and  
20 disposition of many buildings, please include the  
21 environmental impacts of this -- of the demolition of  
22 all -- of every one of these buildings.

23                   Please consider the alternative of storing  
24 all waste on the site. Much waste will be shipped  
25 and dumped in sites across the country. The

34

1 environmental impact of increased waste going to  
2 provide to -- going to private waste storage  
3 facilities must be analyzed. Just because the waste  
4 may end up in a private waste facility, they will  
5 still need to do an environmental impact statement on  
6 the communities near those private storage  
7 facilities.

8                   Thank you.

9                   DR. LAWSON: Thank you very much.

10                   Our next speaker is Astrid Webster, to be  
11 followed by Steve Harrington. And while Ms. Webster  
12 is coming up, I'm reminded that if you have written  
13 comments or if you have them typed out and you would  
14 be willing to give them to us, I know it would be a  
15 big help to the court reporter, please.

16                   MS. WEBSTER: Hi, I'm Astrid, and I would  
17 like this picture to be entered into the record. And I  
18 would like the rest of you to see it, too. Excuse me  
19 for hitting the podium.

20                   I spend a lot of time taking care of

21 children. Today, my two-year-old granddaughter was  
22 at my house, and my five-month-old granddaughter.

23 Now, I notice we're to be congratulated  
24 here, because all of us are white, every single one.

25 Now, my first granddaughter is Italian. So

35

1 she's pretty white.

2 My second granddaughter is half Lebanese,  
3 and she is not very white.

4 Now, I've read enough of a book called "The  
5 Decision to Make the Bomb," to know that we dropped  
6 the bomb on those people -- and there's a picture of  
7 the destruction, but it really doesn't cover it --  
8 because we wanted to scare the Russians, and put them  
9 in their place.

10 Now, I'm a little angry about this, because  
11 I was born in Germany. And the bomb wasn't dropped  
12 on me, not that bomb. They dropped a lot of bombs.  
13 They leveled my Mother's hometown of Darmstadt, and  
14 you know what happened to Dresden. We have fire  
15 power that boggles the mind, and we signed a nuclear  
16 nonproliferation treaty.

17 Oh, I would propose what's needed in this  
18 room and throughout the NNSA and the DOE, which I'm  
19 quite sure used to be the Atomic Energy Commission  
20 when I was a little kid at home in a German rocket  
21 scientist's home. We need a little English lesson,  
22 because what NNSA says is National Nuclear Safety  
23 Administration. This meeting is about making the  
24 world safer for nuclear weapons. It's not about  
25 listening to you.

1 My husband said today, "Honey, you're not  
2 going to a listening, you're going to a hearing."

3 Now, I'm a specialist in music and I give  
4 kids listening tests, and I don't give them hearing  
5 tests. And what I watch is, do they get it?

6 And my first meeting with this kind of  
7 toxic stuff was -- I was going to come here with my  
8 grandkids, but my kids are smart enough to not let me  
9 bring them, because they said, "That's real and  
10 toxic, and I don't want my child exposed to that."  
11 Smart kids, thank you.

12 The English lesson that's needed also is  
13 all of the words we talk about, No Child Left Behind,  
14 are you kidding me? The highest rate of heroin use  
15 is right next door to Los Alamos, the richest  
16 community in the nation.

17 Now, the only thing that's trickling down  
18 to these people is a little bit, and a lot of  
19 despair. What the heck are we doing? I was an  
20 English major in my undergraduate life, I was a  
21 special educator in my graduate life, and this  
22 movement needs some special education.

23 When we have site-wide environmental impact  
24 hearings, not one person spoke up, not one person  
25 spoke up for renewed nuclear weapons. Not one. 27

1 people visited representative Tom Udall's office to  
2 say, "No nuclear weapons," including people from the

3 University of California.

4 I called a week or so ago, and she said,  
5 "You know, the public is strangely silent on this  
6 issue." Gee-whizz, do you want to know why they are  
7 silent? We have three choices here. We have  
8 alternative 1, no action, keep doing the really  
9 stupid thing you did once before. Okay, no  
10 disarmament there.

11 2, transform to a responsive nuclear  
12 weapons complex. Like the garbage can I trip with my  
13 foot, you stand on it and the lid goes up, and some  
14 missile goes out and does this to some baby? What  
15 earthly kind of leaders are we? Where is our  
16 conscience? These weapons aren't launched against  
17 white babies. Even if they're Russian they're not  
18 launched against white babies. They're not launched  
19 against German babies, whose parents just finished  
20 killing six million people. It's nothing, nothing  
21 rational about this. Nothing.

22 Oh, and the math. Let's talk about the  
23 math. People aren't coming out and saying this is  
24 okay, they are saying this is wrong. Not only wrong,  
25 it's dead wrong.

38

1 The first meeting I went to, there was a  
2 really courageous guy here in the audience. He was a  
3 man who said, "I'm a nuclear waste specialist from  
4 Los Alamos, and I'm telling you, we should not build  
5 any more of those, because there is no place to put  
6 the waste."

7 You know, I'm not very religious, but it

8 seems to me if you mind plutonium and it gives you  
9 cancer, that's God's way of saying, "Stop it."

10           There is no rationality here, there's no  
11 safety. This should be the National Insecure --  
12 National Nuclear Insecurity Administration.

13           When -- what's his name -- Robertson -- the  
14 former head of Sandia National Labs, defined  
15 deterrents. He said terrorists, deterrents, has the  
16 same root as terror. English lesson, folks. We are  
17 the primary terrorists.

18           The nuclear proliferation, the world  
19 depends on us, because we're the leaders in that.

20           I was in the UN April of 2004, in which  
21 John Bolton stood up and said, we are behind the  
22 nuclear nonproliferation treaty 100 percent. And I  
23 went, "What"? I was just at a meeting in Los Alamos  
24 and they're talking about building new pits -- excuse  
25 me for walking -- we're talking about building new

39

1 pits, that was like four years ago. And you guys are  
2 still talking about building new pits.

3           And I said, "Mr. Bolton, I have a  
4 question." And it was amazing, all of these white  
5 guys closed in on him, and he walked around like in a  
6 beehive. And I said, "Mr. Bolton, I have a  
7 question," totally ignored me. Maybe he learned that  
8 from George Bush. He's not listening to Cindy  
9 Sheehan, either. What a noble cause.

10           Anything that does this to a human being is  
11 not a noble cause.

12 Before I quit, before my blood pressure  
13 goes too high, I have one more story for you. It's  
14 from John Hershey. My Mother gave me a book by John  
15 Hershey when I was about 21, just married. I was mad  
16 for weeks, I was furious. I wasn't fit to live with.  
17 So here's the story from John Hershey.  
18 This is after Hiroshima. This is a doctor telling  
19 about his experience, and the experience, he says,  
20 "This woman, she was carrying an eight-month-old dead  
21 baby."  
22 They asked her, "Why are you carrying this  
23 baby?"  
24 And she said, "My husband loved this baby.  
25 I want him to see her again before we bury her."

40

1 After four days, of this woman following  
2 this doctor around, he would no longer look at her.  
3 He simply turned his back because it was so  
4 unbearable. And, oh, by the way, there was no place  
5 to bury her, because there were so many dead.

6 So, a lot of people have stood up here  
7 tonight to talk and say they have trouble sleeping.  
8 Me, too. Put that in your math, please.

9 Thank you.

10 DR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next speaker  
11 is Steve Harrington, to be followed by Dave Wunker.

12 MR. HARRINGTON: Thanks to all of the other  
13 speakers. I appreciated you-all's input, thanks to  
14 the organizers. I'm a terrible public speaker, I  
15 hate public speaking, but some things you do because  
16 you have to. You know you go to the dentist because

17 you have to. And that's why I'm up here. And,  
18 personally, I'd rather just sit down and talk to the  
19 court reporter afterwards, but I think it's important  
20 to share our ideas with other citizens. So, I'm up  
21 here as a citizen.

22 Some of the things I want to say have  
23 already been said, and probably better than I will  
24 say them.

25 Number 1, they're really soliciting input

41

1 on the environmental aspects of this, and they give  
2 us three choices, as we've all noted. Sort of a  
3 preordained three choices that we have no input on.

4 But before I get to those -- and I will  
5 mention some environmental issues -- I want to say,  
6 in concurrence with the other speakers, or a lot of  
7 them, that we -- the U.S. government has signed on to  
8 the nonproliferation treaty in 1970. And it was  
9 also -- I don't know the term is -- reratified, or  
10 something, in 1995. There's 188 other nations that  
11 are signatories to that, and we are one of them.

12 And it was ratified by Congress, and signed  
13 by the president, and it's law, it's international  
14 law, and it's U.S. law, that we adhere to it.

15 And Article 6 of that treaty, among other  
16 things -- it says lots of things. One is there were  
17 five countries at the time that had nuclear weapons,  
18 and we were one of them. Those five countries can  
19 continue to have nuclear weapons, but must move  
20 towards disarmament. And that's Article 6.

21 And the other 183 countries were not  
22 allowed to proliferate. It was a bargain. The five  
23 that had it would disarm, and the 183 that didn't  
24 have it wouldn't seek out the weapons.

25 So, this is law. We signed on to it.

42

1 We're not adhering to it.

2 If you tell your kid to clean his room, and  
3 30 years later, or what is it -- however many years  
4 later, they've got one toy put away, but they're  
5 getting ready to bring some new toys out, that's  
6 not -- you're not disarming. You're getting ready to  
7 build more stuff.

8 So, in concurrence with other speakers,  
9 that's issue number one.

10 Now, the question is -- also, before I get  
11 to the environmental issues -- does this really help  
12 our security? And as the other speakers have noted,  
13 when you break your international obligations, you're  
14 encouraging other people to do the same thing, and  
15 other countries to do the same thing.

16 So, really, if this is about security, the  
17 thing that would help us in our bargaining power with  
18 other countries, North Korea, Iran, and whoever else  
19 wants to acquire the weapons, or is in the process of  
20 doing so, is to actually uphold up our end of the  
21 bargain.

22 Now, back to the environmental issues. Ted  
23 did a nice job presenting the NNSA position. But a  
24 lot of stuff he just kind of glossed over. And I  
25 think there's good reason he glossed over it.

1 Because probably they don't want you to really know  
2 the history of some of this stuff.

3 He mentioned on one of his slides the Rocky  
4 Flats plant, which is a former plant that was used to  
5 produce plutonium pits, that was in Colorado and  
6 somewhere outside of Denver. And he mentioned that  
7 they closed it down. But he didn't really tell you  
8 why. I encourage all of you to go home tonight and  
9 Google that, look it up on Wikipedia or whatever  
10 encyclopedia you like to use, do a little research on  
11 what happened at Rocky Flats.

12 I think you will be interested in why they  
13 closed it down, and the FBI raid that occurred there,  
14 and the tritium that leaked into the water supply,  
15 and the -- all kinds of other leaks that resulted in  
16 sand that blew off and contaminated the surrounding  
17 areas. The government actually purchased more land  
18 around it. As it was contaminated, they kept buying  
19 some more land, a time or two, to kind of build the  
20 boundaries up so maybe the waste wouldn't be off  
21 site.

22 Well, that didn't work. And, ultimately,  
23 there was a class-action lawsuit. I think it was  
24 resolved recently. It was in the courts for probably  
25 over a decade. And 12,000 landowners joined together

1 in a class. And those 12,000 landowners sued some of  
2 the contractors, which I think were Rockwell and Dow

3 Chemical, some of the usual suspects that profit off  
4 of the backs of the citizens.

5 And, so, I think people need to look into  
6 that before you just gloss it over on a slide.

7 So, I'm concerned about -- that's sort of a  
8 general statement, but specifically the environmental  
9 questions that they're going to -- there will be a  
10 nice report on this. I've seen an environmental  
11 impact statement before, and they're quite thorough  
12 or they appear to be. And they will be  
13 well-documented, well-referenced, and it will all  
14 generally say, yeah, there are potential hazards, but  
15 we can control them. Yeah, these are risks, but if  
16 we do it right -- well, and I'm sure they were trying  
17 to do it right at Rocky Flats, and look at what  
18 happened.

19 So a lot of these things, you just can't do  
20 right. These are dangerous substances, and once  
21 they're out there, it's tough to remediate. Even if  
22 you can remediate it -- which truthfully you can't --  
23 but if you could, it costs billions and billions of  
24 dollars.

25 Now, one of the reasons we are up here --

45

1 and probably the main reason we're up here, not  
2 citizens, but the organizations, is to adhere to the  
3 NEPA, the National Environment Policy Act.

4 So that it's mandated by law that they hold  
5 these hearings, as Ted mentioned, it was passed in  
6 1969.

7 Well, I found that interesting that in 1969

8 they passed that law, 1970 is when the  
9 nonproliferation treaty was passed.

10 So, we're up here busily adhering the law  
11 passed in 1969. And the law passed in 1970, one year  
12 later, we are busily ignoring it.

13 Well, you know, laws are laws, you've got  
14 to adhere to them. If you don't like them, don't  
15 pass them. If you don't like these treaties, don't  
16 sign on to them, don't ratify them, and so forth.

17 Now, the final point I want to make is a  
18 lot of the slides had, what I'm going to call -- from  
19 when I was in college, my math professors and my  
20 physics professors, used to call it hand-waving.  
21 It's when you put something up there and you don't  
22 really have a justification for it, so you say it,  
23 and you kind of wave your hand, and you hope nobody  
24 calls you on it and says "prove that." There was a  
25 lot of that on these slides. In fact, you know, a

46

1 good percentage of it.

2 As other speakers have noted, there's words  
3 like "reasonable. We only want reasonable comments."

4 Okay, I'm going to wave my hand and  
5 whatever I suggest is reasonable and what you guys  
6 suggest is not reasonable.

7 And I also saw some stuff about  
8 stewardship, and nice warm fuzzy words that -- words  
9 that make you feel good, like, you know, we're good  
10 stewards of our nuclear waste. Well, actually they  
11 are not.

12 I mean, stewardship is a good thing but,  
13 first of all, do we need the waste at all? Should we  
14 be producing it? And even if we do, the facts bear  
15 out that they're not good stewards. In fact, they're  
16 bad stewards, as they were at Rocky Flats, and other  
17 places.

18 More hand waving with the cost savings.  
19 And I think other people have mentioned that. You  
20 can't just say there's a cost savings and not justify  
21 it. There would be a great cost savings if we  
22 adhered to the treaty and started disarming.

23 Thank you.

24 DR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Harrington.  
25 Our next speaker is Dave Wunker, and he would be

47

1 followed by Tom Delahanty.

2 MR. WUNKER: Hi, I'm Dave Wunker. I am  
3 opposed to the construction of any nuclear weapons  
4 complex or plutonium trigger-making facility for the  
5 following reasons:

6 The construction of such a facility will  
7 violate this nation's legal obligation to reduce and  
8 eliminate nuclear weapons under the nuclear  
9 nonproliferation treaty.

10 The construction of such a facility will  
11 make this nation a hypocrite to people the world over  
12 as we demand that other people observe the  
13 nonproliferation treaty, and forgo the development of  
14 nuclear weapons. As U.S. Representative Ed Markey of  
15 Massachusetts said, "America cannot preach  
16 temperance -- nuclear temperance from a barstool."

17           The construction of such a facility is  
18 immoral economically. The entire Complex 2030  
19 estimated cost of 5 to 10 billion, would be better  
20 spent to provide healthcare insurance to some of the  
21 45 percent of Americans without it, or to raise the  
22 minimum wage, which is at its lowest real value since  
23 1960.

24           The construction of this facility will be  
25 favored by some, because it will provide jobs and

48

1 economic development. However, in my view, working  
2 for such a facility or profiting from its  
3 construction would not be right livelihood.

4           And finally, the construction of such a  
5 facility will not make us more secure. As we seem to  
6 have forgotten since the end of the Cold War, nobody  
7 will win -- will be a winner in a nuclear war. Nor  
8 will nuclear weapons protect us from terrorists.  
9 However, terrorists can effectively use nuclear  
10 weapons.

11           Do not build this facility.

12           Thank you.

13           DR. LAWSON: Okay, our speaker is Tom  
14 Delehanty, followed by R. Epstein.

15           MR. DELEHANTY: Good evening, everyone. My  
16 name is Tom Delehanty. I am a father, a husband, I'm  
17 a decorated Vietnam Marine, I'm a farmer, I'm a  
18 community member, I'm a United States citizen, I'm a  
19 citizen of New Mexico. I'm totally opposed to  
20 starting nuclear weapons again.

21 Our country has spent -- in my short  
22 lifetime -- close to \$5 trillion on nuclear weapons.  
23 That, to me, is horrendous. The amount that this  
24 young, wonderful country could use that money for,  
25 for the future.

49

1 And I'm also here to speak for -- as this  
2 young grandmother was speaking for -- the children of  
3 this -- of mine, their children, the children of the  
4 community, the children, their children, the children  
5 in the state, their children, the children in this  
6 United States, and their children, and the children  
7 of the planet, and their children, because they  
8 cannot speak here today.

9 And there are decisions continuing to be  
10 made, that there were made before I was born, that I  
11 hold against those policy makers. And I think the  
12 children of the rest of the Earth will hold us  
13 responsible for what we do.

14 We spent this money, we have 750 bases  
15 around the world now on other property -- other  
16 countries' soil. And that's without our own. Well,  
17 what is enough? Where did our benefit from the Cold  
18 War come from? Why is this going on? All of it.  
19 And I'm just here to speak for the children today,  
20 because they cannot speak for themselves, and they  
21 are the future. They do own this planet, their  
22 children and their children. It's not us.

23 We have to make very wise and moral  
24 policies based on nonproliferation as the strongest  
25 soul superpower. We have to do that.

1                   And, again, I will leave you with, the  
2 children are screaming at us to make the right  
3 decisions, and all of this matter, thank you.

4                   DR. LAWSON: Thank you very much.

5                   Okay, our next speaker is Mr. Epstein, to  
6 be followed by Scott Donofrio.

7                   MR. EPSTEIN: My name is Richard L.  
8 Epstein. Mr. Wyka said the nuclear -- well, the  
9 NNSA, cannot pick and choose which directives to  
10 carry out.

11                   I would like to say to Mr. Wyka personally,  
12 to the young lady who spoke to us first, to each one  
13 of you who are involved in this project, I look at  
14 each of you. The Agency does not have the power to  
15 choose which directives to carry out, but each of you  
16 do. Each of you has the possibility, young lady, you  
17 can do something decent with your life. You can quit  
18 your job. Mr. Wyka, it's personal, your mother did  
19 not raise you to become a mass murderer. There is  
20 nothing for nuclear weapons except mass murder. You  
21 are asking how to become efficient at that. That our  
22 government has said that is a good idea is not good  
23 enough. Each of you knows that. You cannot  
24 rationalize away what bombs do. There is no good use  
25 for your work except to dismantle all nuclear

1 weapons. If you do anything else, you will be held  
2 accountable.

3 Crimes against humanity, and if the weapons  
4 are ever used, you will be war criminals. You have  
5 the option, you can stand up. It's not easy to give  
6 up a paycheck and the honors the government gives  
7 you, but you have that possibility. I urge each of  
8 you, do something decent with your lives.

9 DR. LAWSON: Thank you.

10 Our next speaker is Scott Donofrio.

11 MR. DONOFRIO: Thank you.

12 DR. LAWSON: And as you approach the  
13 podium, I will say yours is the last name that I have  
14 here, and what I will propose is that when you  
15 finish, we would take a short break, and I will find  
16 out if anybody else wants to speak. And we'll take a  
17 short break for the court reporter, then we'll come  
18 back, or continue the recess.

19 Please.

20 MR. DONOFRIO: Thank you.

21 I can use a break. This has been hard.  
22 I'm a physician, and I'm on call. So I got a call in  
23 the middle of the presentation, and that  
24 presentation, according to my cell phone, was two  
25 minutes and 24 seconds. And I don't really know how

52

1 long the presentation was, but I think it was  
2 probably about 20 minutes. And what I thought the  
3 presentation was about, based on its title, was an  
4 environmental impact statement. But I missed that  
5 part because I was on that call. I missed all of the  
6 environmental stuff. There was a slide, and it had a  
7 list of things that could be impacted.

8                   So, I guess it doesn't really matter,  
9 because it's just this list, and I can read it now.

10                   But, you know, I guess I might suggest that  
11 if you have a particular -- if you have a particular  
12 point to make, like, you know, you have a  
13 presentation about an environmental impact, that  
14 missing the point of your own presentation,  
15 undermines that point a little bit.

16                   I realize the temptation to gloss over the  
17 nonwarm and nonfuzzy is strong. But I make that  
18 suggestion nonetheless.

19                   I heard some nonwarm and some nonfuzzy  
20 about Rocky Flats, and that was some education about  
21 potential environmental impact. As a physician I  
22 tend to consider treatments that have worked before  
23 or not worked that well before, or had side effects  
24 before, to be likely to produce a similar effect the  
25 next time. So that made some sense to me. Thank

53

1 you, Mr. Kovac.

2                   But the part where I didn't hear anything  
3 about the environment led me to ask some questions,  
4 and I tried to do that. But I still don't know  
5 anything about the environmental impact that I can  
6 expect Complex 2030 to have.

7                   I thought I would make that point as sort  
8 of separate from the rest of what I wanted to say.

9                   I actually -- I just want to invoke a  
10 couple of images from the media.

11                   But, first, I would like to sort of remind

12 the audience that Mr. Mello said earlier, the  
13 customer doesn't want the product any more.

14 So, with that in mind, I would like to  
15 invoke our collective memory of a movie that featured  
16 plutonium. You might remember "Back to the Future,"  
17 when not even the charismatic Michael J. Fox could  
18 keep the favor of the crowd when he was playing his  
19 guitar on stage, exposing him to AD cells hard rock.  
20 But they were '50s. They didn't get it.

21 He had a product of the future, so the  
22 customers didn't want the product yet.

23 I work in mental health in rural Socorro,  
24 New Mexico, where the community is not yet committed  
25 enough to mental health to provide clear support.

54

1 That is, sufficient funding for me to do my job as a  
2 psychiatrist. I'm working here for now. I saw a  
3 patient today. But I'm not sure my job is  
4 sustainable yet. Mental health programs are growing  
5 and developing around the country, and it's a safe  
6 bet that as we move forward, the public will ensure  
7 the funding is present to support my type of work  
8 here, and in this kind and around the country as they  
9 have been doing. Another case of the customer not  
10 wanting the product yet.

11 But as it was pointed out earlier, the case  
12 with the nuclear weapons, and your jobs. All right.  
13 My job is in question. I may not make it. I may not  
14 be able to keep doing my job here. I may have to  
15 leave. I mean, I get paid. But some day, 20 years  
16 from now, probably here I will be able to come back

17 and do that. Your jobs aren't going to be that way.

18 So, not only for the reasons mentioned by  
19 the immediately previous speaker, about morality, but  
20 also for your own self-preservation, give it some  
21 thought.

22 Thank you.

23 DR. LAWSON: Thank you.

24 Okay. Thank you. Could I have a show of  
25 hands of other people who would like to speak before

55

1 we close up tonight, just so I have some sense of  
2 that.

3 MS. ALBRECHT: Is there a chance we could  
4 just go right ahead with it, you know, now that we're  
5 worked up, get everybody done with and not go for  
6 this break?

7 DR. LAWSON: Well, I have to ask the court  
8 reporter. Are you all right? She said that she  
9 would go ahead if there are other speakers, and we're  
10 going to be here till 10:00 o'clock, anyway. So, if  
11 anybody would like to speak, they may. Is there  
12 anyone who would like to speak? Yes?

13 MS. ALBRECHT: I will speak.

14 DR. LAWSON: Okay, please come on up.

15 MS. ALBRECHT: This being a scoping, an  
16 environmental --

17 DR. LAWSON: May I just ask you for your  
18 name?

19 MS. ALBRECHT: Yes, Kathryn Albrecht,  
20 K-A-T-H-R-Y-N, A-L-B-R-E-C-H-T. I live in Socorro.

21 I work here at the University.

22 And as far as scoping the public for issues  
23 for an environmental impact statement or an  
24 environmental assessment, either one, looking at  
25 Los Alamos as a site for these projects, you would

56

1 need to look at the water quality. We expect the  
2 draft EIS to look at the water quality. And already  
3 the water quality has been severely compromised as  
4 evidenced by the monitoring of the runoff after the  
5 Sierra Grande fire on the Los Alamos site.

6 That water reached the Rio Grande and  
7 carried radionuclide, on the air quality. We had to  
8 look at air quality for a variety of points of view  
9 in Northern New Mexico, that I used to live directly  
10 downwind of Los Alamos for many, many years, and we  
11 were told in probably the '80s that one in four of us  
12 on the planet, let's say, at least in America, would  
13 be expiring of cancer. And we're now told that it's  
14 closer to two out of four individuals.

15 And, obviously, that's direction we are  
16 moving, for a variety of reasons. But we all know  
17 that radiation causes cancer. And so that's only  
18 increasing.

19 I know that we had our Geiger counter on  
20 during the Sierra Grande fire, and the day the winds  
21 shifted, and headed directly into Taos, several days  
22 into the fire, our Geiger counter went up  
23 300 percent.

24 So, you would be looking at the risk of  
25 wildfire, you know, the external threat of Los Alamos

1 being located directly in the wildfire zone. I think  
2 Greg Mello, who started his testimony tonight, flew  
3 over Los Alamos during the Sierra Grande fire, and  
4 saw that the flames were lifting to -- it ended  
5 within 500 yards, Greg, was that true, of the storage  
6 tents, the inflated storage tents for the plutonium  
7 that's sitting, awaiting approval to be shipped some  
8 day.

9           So there's air, water, wildfire in general,  
10 people's health in general, these are all  
11 environmental issues -- soil. From the day I moved  
12 to New Mexico in 1970, I was told that the arroyos of  
13 Los Alamos -- and it was clearly marked on the  
14 roadside when you drive through trying to go  
15 sightseeing at all, you should not cross the barbed  
16 wire fence, the low places from years of dumping, the  
17 early work in the lab, those -- all of those little  
18 draws were hot.

19           And that all needs to be reclaimed, and it  
20 hasn't all been reclaimed. And it's true that we  
21 don't know what to do with the waste. So that's the  
22 major environmental issue for any nation that takes  
23 part in splitting the atom for any purpose, is that  
24 we have no idea what to do with the waste. We are  
25 pretty smart. I really admire -- you know, I went to

1 a science and engineering school, and I really admire  
2 what my colleagues -- the envelope that they are

3 pushing in every imaginable field.

4 But for some reason, we haven't come up  
5 with a single solution to what to do with the  
6 radioactive waste. We're probably not going to,  
7 because this is a very finite planet, it's a very  
8 small planet, and we all know that blasting into  
9 space, you know, brings the threat of our rockets  
10 exploding. So here we are. So what do we do? We  
11 stop doing it some day or it stops us.

12 So, please, scope of those environmental  
13 issues. Please realize that the violation of the  
14 nonproliferation treaty and thumbing our nose at the  
15 world court decision is criminal, and it hasn't won  
16 us a single friend, and we simply got to get with it  
17 regardless of the fact that there's very frightening  
18 and threatening enemies out there. We know that they  
19 only grow and are ticked at us every day, and  
20 determined to stop us.

21 And with that said, my last point, if I can  
22 recall it, would be -- there's always that one last  
23 point that you wish you remembered when you're done.

24 A supplement to a site-wide environmental  
25 impact statement. Well, I'm pretty sure that the

59

1 issue of democracy and people feeling like they don't  
2 have a voice when they actually do, because NEPA's  
3 great, and we are at least following that law by  
4 holding these hearings. And, so, go on in that  
5 direction, and get it right this time, cancel the  
6 expansion of the Lab, cancel relocating a plutonium  
7 pit facility at some other lab. Build down in Idaho

8 instead of up, clean up Tennessee, stop creating two  
9 to four important accidents at Pantex in Texas every  
10 year.

11 Turn our national labs here in the state,  
12 Sandia and Los Alamos into R&D Centers fully funded  
13 to solve the problems we need to solve.

14 And I just recalled the story I wanted to  
15 tell at the end, and that is that I was able and  
16 privileged to read the quarterly minutes and  
17 newsletter coming out of the committee for  
18 disarmament in the UN, oh, probably throughout the  
19 '90s, as Pakistan and India came to every single  
20 session and spent the week begging the United States  
21 to inhabit the nonproliferation treaty and stop and  
22 disarm, and we didn't do it.

23 And they said month after month, year after  
24 year, until they were blue in the face, that they  
25 would not assemble, and they would not test if we

60

1 would honor our treaty obligations. You see what  
2 happened?

3 I would like to remind everyone in this  
4 room tonight on the issue of Iran, that as a party to  
5 the nonproliferation treaty, they have every right in  
6 the world to be doing everything that we know that  
7 they're doing, with the same toxicity that we toy  
8 with, on a much more massive scale daily. There is  
9 diplomacy that can be exercised here. And if that  
10 doesn't work -- I mean, is this working? All bets  
11 will be off if the stuff doesn't work. We have to do

12 our best, and we're clearly not.

13 So let's retool Los Alamos. We all have a  
14 lot of good work to do. Thank you very much.

15 DR. LAWSON: Thank you.

16 Is there anyone else that would like to  
17 speak at this time? Okay, now, this is how we will  
18 proceed. I am going to call a recess, and anybody  
19 who would like to speak formally to the whole  
20 audience will just let me know, and we will reconvene  
21 for you to do so. If there is anybody who would  
22 prefer not to speak in front of the whole group, but  
23 would like to give testimony privately to the court  
24 reporter, you are certainly welcome to do that at any  
25 time.

61

1 And because I called a recess, some of you  
2 may decide that you are not going to stay to hear if  
3 there's anybody else that's going to speak. And if  
4 you are leaving, I just want to thank you very much,  
5 first of all, for coming this evening and learning  
6 about the program, and for your heart-felt and  
7 well-thought-out comments. We really appreciate  
8 that.

9 And, so -- but you are invited to stick  
10 around in case there's somebody else who would like  
11 to speak. And, of course, there be will be an  
12 opportunity to ask questions of the staff that's  
13 here.

14 So at this moment, I will say it's now  
15 9:15, and we will recess until or unless we have  
16 somebody else that would like to speak, thank you.

17 (Recess taken.)

18 DR. LAWSON: It is now 10:00 o'clock, and  
19 we have not had anybody who has come to me saying  
20 that they wish to speak. So, in a second, I will  
21 adjourn this meeting. Before I do, I want to thank  
22 our court reporter, Beverly Schleimer, I want to  
23 thank the people here at the New Mexico Tech for the  
24 great facilities, all of the speakers who came, took  
25 the time to come to speak tonight, as well as the DOE

62

1 officials.

2 Tomorrow there will be meetings in the  
3 morning and the evening in Albuquerque, and with that  
4 I will say this meeting is now adjourned.

5 (The above hearing was adjourned at 10:01  
6 p.m.)

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21  
22  
23  
24  
25

63

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
2 COUNTY OF BERNALILLO SS.

3

4

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

\_\_\_\_\_  
Beverly Ann Schleimer, RDR  
Certified Court Reporter #66  
License expires: 12-31-06

1 RECEIPT  
2 JOB NUMBER: 2495A BEV December 4, 2006  
3 CASE CAPTION: COMPLEX 2030 SCOPING MEETING-SOCORRO  
4 \*\*\*\*\*  
5 TETRA TECH - JACQUELINE K. BOLTZ  
6 DOCUMENT: Transcript / Exhibits / Disks / Other \_\_\_\_\_  
7 DATE DELIVERED: \_\_\_\_\_ DEL' D BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
8 REC' D BY: \_\_\_\_\_ TIME: \_\_\_\_\_  
9 \*\*\*\*\*  
10 ATTORNEY:  
11 DOCUMENT: Transcript / Exhibits / Disks / Other \_\_\_\_\_  
12 DATE DELIVERED: \_\_\_\_\_ DEL' D BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
13 REC' D BY: \_\_\_\_\_ TIME: \_\_\_\_\_  
14 \*\*\*\*\*  
15 ATTORNEY:  
16 DOCUMENT: Transcript / Exhibits / Disks / Other \_\_\_\_\_  
17 DATE DELIVERED: \_\_\_\_\_ DEL' D BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
18 REC' D BY: \_\_\_\_\_ TIME: \_\_\_\_\_  
19 \*\*\*\*\*  
20 ATTORNEY:  
21 DOCUMENT: Transcript / Exhibits / Disks / Other \_\_\_\_\_  
22 DATE DELIVERED: \_\_\_\_\_ DEL' D BY: \_\_\_\_\_  
23 REC' D BY: \_\_\_\_\_ TIME: \_\_\_\_\_  
24  
25