

- - - - -

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PUBLIC HEARING

Evening Session

Before Gina L. Smith, Certified Court Reporter

At the North Augusta Community Center

495 Brookside Avenue

North Augusta, South Carolina

On Thursday, February 21, 2008

- - - - -

AUGUSTA WEST/CULPEPPER REPORTING

Certified Court Reporters

505 Courthouse Lane

Augusta, Georgia 30901

(706) 722-3746 or (706) 863-3918

1-800-592-3376 (Depo)

MR. LAWSON: Good evening. We thank you for taking time to participate in this important public hearing on the National Nuclear Security Administration's Supplementary Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement or Supplemental PEIS on the transformation of the nation's nuclear weapons complex. I hope you've had an adequate opportunity to browse the displays over here and to talk to project staff during the just-completed open house. My name is Barry Lawson and I'm the neutral moderator for this hearing. My role this evening is to ensure opportunities for those who are attending the hearing to obtain information about the proposed program and to provide their comments on it as well as to make sure that everyone observes a few basic ground rules intended to provide for a fair and respectful participation by all. As you signed in at the registration table you should have received a participant's packet which contains information on the transformation of the nuclear weapons complex. There are two parts to this hearing. The informal segment began with the open house and continues after my remarks with a brief welcome video from Mr. Robert

Smollen, who is the Deputy Administration--excuse me--Deputy Administrator for the Defense Programs and a 20-minute presentation by Ted Wyka, the Supplemental PEIS Document Manager. Mr. Wyka will discuss the Complex Transformation project and the contents of the Supplemental PEIS. The formal segment of the hearing will begin following his presentation. And during that formal segment members of the public will be called to make oral comments on the PEIS. The court reporter will then begin making a verbatim record of your comments. There will be no exchange of questions and answers. And the officials will be here to listen to your comments but will not be engaging in dialogue. If you wish to make an oral comment during the formal comment segment you will need to have signed up at the registration table if you have not done so already. I will be recognizing speakers as their names appear on the registration list that will be provided to me. The ground rules for speakers provide additional information on providing your comments. In the formal session members of the public will be allotted up to 3 minutes. Now, we had fifty-five people speak this afternoon and I had to try to enforce--it wasn't always successful--keeping people to the 3 minutes. I'm not under, I don't believe, such constraints tonight. I

would recommend if you could be concise to 3 minutes that would be fine, but if you'd like up to 5 minutes I certainly can grant that to you. I do ask, or urge you rather, to make your comments concise and to the point of the content of the PEIS. Now, should you have a longer written statement please summarize those comments orally and then submit the written documents in their entirety to me before you leave. If you believe that you will need more than the allotted time let me know and if time remains, which I'm sure it does, before the published end time of the meeting, which is 10:00 this evening, I'll be pleased to provide additional time for you after everyone has had his or her initial opportunity to comment during this segment.

We'll be here to take all of your comments. That's it for the agenda and for the hearing format. Are there any questions before we move on? Okay. Great. Once again, thank you for your cooperation in making this a productive and respectful hearing. And I look forward to your participation. Now we will turn to an 8-minute video with Mr. Smollen, after which it will be followed by Ted Wyka.

[Video presentation by Mr. Smollen.]

[Slide presentation by Mr. Wyka.]

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Wyka. Appreciate your presentation. I will now read into the record for verbatim transcription my introductory remarks for the public comment hearing. This portion of our hearing is officially designated as the Savannah River Public Hearing for the National Nuclear Security Administration's Supplemental PEIS for the Complex Transformation program. This evening segment of the hearing is being held on February 21st, 2008, in the North Augusta, South Carolina Community Center. It's being held to receive comments on the content of the Supplemental PEIS. We are commencing the public comment portion of this hearing at approximately 7:35 p.m. and are scheduled to adjourn once all participants have had a chance to make their comments or 10:00 p.m. at the latest. Each speaker will have a maximum of 5 minutes. We will begin with the elected state and federal officials, if any. This hearing was preceded by a presentation by NNSA's PEIS Document Manager, Mr. Ted Wyka. Mr. Wyka will also represent the Administration in listening to and accepting your comments. For the record, my name is Barry Lawson. I've been asked by the Administration to conduct this comment period as an independent and neutral moderator.

I will ensure that the ground rules reviewed earlier in the evening are followed. The court reporter tonight is Gina Smith. And her task is to create a complete and accurate transcription of this hearing and a verbatim transcript of oral comments received tonight will be included in the Administration's record of these proceedings. NNSA will place copies of the transcript from this and other public hearings in its Freedom of Information Act designated reading rooms as soon as practical. Now, if you wish to make oral comments tonight you must have first signed up at the registration table. I will recognize speakers in the order in which they've registered, allowing, as I said earlier, elected federal and state officials, if any, to go first. Now, I would ask you if you would please remain in this room if you are scheduled to speak. I will be calling three speakers at a time, the current and the next two, so that you will have some warning before you are to speak. And if you currently hear your name as being on deck if you could move to the forward part of this room that would save a little time in coming and going. When it is your turn to speak I'd ask you to go to this podium over here to my left and this will help the court reporter to make an accurate record of your comments. Please remember the time

limit and the fact that this hearing on the Supplemental PEIS for the proposed project. If you are approaching the time limit I will give a signal by telling you there's 30 seconds left, asking you to summarize your remaining comments as quickly and as gracefully as possible. It's in my discretion to call a break or a recess in the proceedings, if necessary, to give the court reporter or others of us a breather.

Also because we'd like to make sure that we have as accurate a presentation as possible or transcript as possible if you find it necessary to take a phone call or to have a conversation if you could step into the other room I'd greatly appreciate it. Commenters are recommended to state their name for the court reporter's record and if you have a written copy of your comments or if you have a written document that you would like to submit as an exhibit please bring it to me after you have spoken. Written materials will be formally accepted into the record as exhibits to the hearing in addition to the oral comments and each, whether they're written or oral, are weighed equally by the NNSA. Bear in mind that you may also submit comments by U.S. mail, email, fax or telephone at anytime until the close of the comment period on April 10th. There is no limitation on the number of length

of comments an individual may submit.

Getting that out of the way, we can begin. And the first speaker that I have on my list this evening is Nancy Bobbitt. And she would be followed by Tom Clements and Ed Arnold.

MS. BOBBITT: Good evening. I'm Nancy Bobbitt, Senior Field Representative for U.S. Senator Johnny Isakson from Georgia.

The letter reads: We appreciate the Department of Energy holding this public hearing. It is important for members of this community to have the opportunity to hear firsthand about the Department's transformation plan for our nation's nuclear weapons complex. First let us state that we support the Department of Energy's efforts to transition to a more efficient and secure nuclear weapons complex. The Department is rightly looking toward the future needs rather than practices of the past. While transition always brings about change, there is no question in our minds that the Savannah River Site will continue to be a critical piece of the DOE Complex. We know that the Department of Energy cannot find better infrastructure, better expertise, or a more supportive community for a nuclear program than right here at the Savannah River Site. We look forward to continuing this relationship for many

years to come. Signed, Saxby Chambliss, United States Senate, Georgia; Johnny Isakson, United States Senate, Georgia.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Our next speaker then would be Tom Clements with Ed Arnold and Betsy Rivard to follow.

MR. CLEMENTS: Good evening. My name is Tom Clements and I'm here to speak on behalf of the environmental organization Friends of the Earth, which is the largest international network of environmental organizations in the world with offices in more than forty countries. And I'd like to thank Mr. Wyka and everyone participating in this. And I would comment--Mr. Wyka, I think he is an exemplary federal official in the way you've conducted yourself throughout this whole process and I think everybody appreciates that. And I would also like to thank the officials at Savannah River Site who also try to conduct themselves in that way as well. I can't say the same thing of people at the DOE headquarters, unfortunately, who were very unresponsive to public information requests, and I hope that situation will shortly change.

I just wanted to make a few brief unprepared comments, but I wanted to share with people what happened at the earlier session today. There was quite a crowd here. In my 20 years or more of participating in these DOE EIS proceedings on a host of issues I've really never seen such a mixture of people participating. There were students of all ages. Students as young as 12 years old testified and people in their 80s. Including the groups that are participating tonight there were over fifteen public interest organizations participating. But I think the most impressive thing I had never seen at these hearings is all fifty-four people who commented expressed great concern about the Complex Transformation plan. There was nobody speaking in favor of it. And I know a lot of the comments of the 30,000-plus that went on in the scoping were similar. So I think the public is speaking on this issue from a national perspective, very aware that--what the climate is internationally and that things are changing. But it was most heartening to me to see the wide range of people that did participate today. Just making a few comments on this document, I find it quite interesting some of the language used in it. While Mr. Wyka said

that this is not a--it's not a political document, it's an environmental impact statement document, this is actually very much a political document and I think a lot of our comments are along that line as well. And the language used in the document is quite interesting, which, to me, reflects a political position rather than anything to do with environmental impact. If you have paid attention to the presentation or read some of the documents or even looked at one of the summary documents or other documents themselves, an example of the language is--they're calling the new nuclear weapons production facilities consolidated centers of excellence or distributed centers of excellence. And to me that's really language to camouflage what's going on. So I find that quite interesting, the play with words. And they also say that the consolidated centers of excellence, which would be smaller sites with the nuclear weapons fabrication facilities at just a couple of sites, they would have a modular arrangement of facilities and then, in parentheses, campus. So they call this a campus. So it's like some kind of educational pursuit that's going on at these facilities when, in fact, it's nuclear weapons production. So I found that quite interesting. And, to me, that is one of the things that shows this is, in fact, a political

document and, while I appreciate the ability to comment here on the EIS part and I'll submit more comments, let me address a few more aspects of the political nature of it. As Mr. Wyka said, this document is based on the nuclear posture review from the year 2001. And that document, as you know, changed some U.S. policy towards first-strike small weapons to be used against threats.

This document--the Vice President had a big hand in this. And I think it does not reflect what is going on in the country now or what is going on in Congress. And on page S12 let me just read you this, what the guiding policy is here. The current nuclear weapons production infrastructure is not sufficiently responsive or cost effective. Responsiveness is the ability to quickly react to new developments and threats. And, to me, this implies this document is designed around--still around the capacity to have a first-strike nuclear weapon to respond to some kind of terroristic threat out there where nuclear weapons are not useful. So I would really question if this is really an environmental document but rather a political document. The government accountability office has estimated that the Complex Transformation could cost up to \$150 billion in a report a couple of years ago. And given that money is going to be shorter this is going

to affect possibly the cleanup at Savannah River Site and other sites. This year the environmental management budget is about 1.4 billion at Savannah River. And I think everybody supports keeping the levels funded. Cleanup is king at Savannah River. So this program could actually, in my opinion, jeopardize money that's going to the cleanup. But I want to make a prediction. I remember when we were talking about building the Modern Pit Facility, one of the facilities discussed in here but not with that name, back at the EIS process in 2003, I think, that while there was great support to get that facility here I predicted that would never happen. And I don't think it's going to happen, and I think that the fact that there's not a lot of people from--advocating the site here that it's basically--people see that it's not going to happen here. And I predict about this document that it's--while a record decision may be reached sometime this year what is being advocated in this document, because it's based on old policies, is dead on arrival. We're going to go through some other reiteration that will come out. But it's not going to be this new process we're engaged in right now because things are going to change in the Congress and with the presidency. And I feel pretty sure about that.

MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

MR. CLEMENTS: And let me just mention that the Moscow Treaty is around 2,000 nuclear weapons deployed. But one of the questions is how many weapons are in the hedge? How many weapons are garnered in warehouses somewhere? So we have to look at what's in the--in the stockpile in reserve, what's the amount of weapons that we have. So DOE wants to maintain the capacity to build new nuclear weapons, rebuild all the old nuclear weapons, yet the no-action alternative in the document is essentially the status quo. It's to let the complex go along and do upgrades as necessary. So I think that the document is flawed in that the no-action alternative actually should be disarmament, which is required under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, article 6 of the treaty. So I would request that the Department of Energy go back and redo this document and include as the no-action alternative disarmament and dismantlement of the nuclear weapons. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Before we go to our next speaker I just remind you that if you have a longer piece that you have written out if you would summarize your comments and submit that whole thing I'd appreciate it. And certainly if there is time, which I

believe there will be, after each person has an initial opportunity if you'd like to come back with more comments you're welcome to do that. Our next speaker is Ed Arnold and be followed by Betsy Rivard and John Lindsey.

DR. ARNOLD: Thank you, Mr. Lawson and Mr. Wyka. We appreciate very much the opportunity to be here tonight. My name is Ed Arnold and I am speaking to you behalf of the Georgia members of Physicians for Social Responsibility. We have a range of 360 members in the state of Georgia. Physicians for Social Responsibility was founded in 1961 and since that time has been bringing information, technical expertise, medical expertise to the issue of nuclear weapons. We've been concerned about the environmental health hazards which have led significantly to increased human morbidity and mortality. The independent research that has been done has often challenged assumptions underlying the information made available to the American public by the U.S. government regarding nuclear weapons and has contributed to the advancement of the scientific knowledge in the area of vital importance to public policy. So my comments are based on that independent research conducted by several--through several decades by Physicians for Social Responsibility.

First comment we have is the proposed Complex Transformation program endangers the environment and human health. I want to point out that since the Manhattan Project began hundreds of thousands of nuclear weapons workers have been exposed to ionizing radiation. In 2000 the government finally acknowledged that and began a program of compensating victims. Last summer the Rocky Mountain News reported on the basis of government figures that the U.S. nuclear weapons program has sickened three hundred and--excuse me--has sickened 36,500 Americans and killed more than 4,000. These numbers reflect only those individuals that have been compensated. We know that many more workers have actually been exposed to ionizing radiation. The Department of Energy's Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for the Complex Transformation fails to state adequately the true environmental and human health impacts of this plan. And there are several reasons for that. First, risk estimates are calculated for each alternative at each site for each potential exposure separately, for example, waste exposure, water exposure or air emissions. Now, we know from medical science that radiation exposures are cumulative. So when you list out possible exposure to radiation separately like that you end up and you trivialize the

potential human health effects that are potentially brought to members of the community or to workers. We think that the EIS needs to go back and do that cumulatively rather than the separate indication, as I said.

Secondly, the U.S. government still estimates the risk of low levels of radiation using reference man characteristics. Many people living near the proposed Complex Transformation sites do not have the anatomical or physiological characteristics of an average Caucasian male in a healthy weight range. We know that women are more susceptible to risks of ionizing radiation. We know that infants, children, especially pregnant women, individuals with--whose immune systems are compromised and other chronically ill persons would be affected differently from reference man. So we think that we need--that there needs to be an evaluation of the potential radiation exposure to these other types of--these people in these other categories, not just reference man.

Our consideration of the allowable exposure doesn't find consistency with the BEIR VII report from the National Academy of Sciences nor with the recent cohort study of cancer risk among radiation workers from fifteen countries including over 5.2 million

person-years of followup. We think that this most recent rigorous investigation needs to be incorporated, the results of that in determining what the appropriate--what the appropriate radiation exposure would be.

Second major point we have is that the assumed national security benefits of the proposed Complex Transformation program do not balance its environmental and public health dangers. In other words, we think that the production of new nuclear weapons is not worth the potential to workers and communities--the potential dangers to workers and communities. I'd like to point out that one of the, we think, underemphasized activities that will result from this program will be the testing of nuclear weapons again. And we know that from priori testing which we were told were--was perfectly safe at the time that it was conducted, have caused 80,000 cancers and 17,000 deaths in the United States.

MR. LAWSON: Mr. Arnold, how much more time would you like to have?

DR. ARNOLD: Let me wrap up in about the next half minute or so.

MR. LAWSON: Okay.

DR. ARNOLD: So there have been--another point

that I want to make that I think is extremely important is that there is growing consensus subscribed to by many people across the U.S. including Henry Kissinger and former Senator Sam Nunn that the most appropriate future number of nuclear weapons in our stockpile should be zero. I think this information needs to be taken back. I know that you've indicated that that's not your job to do, but we'd like you to do that. We will expand and make more specific these comments. Once again, I would like to thank you very much for the opportunity to speak.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much, sir. All right. Our next speaker is Betsy Rivard and she'll be followed by John Lindsey and Ernie Chaput.

MS. RIVARD: Hi. My name is Betsy Rivard. I spent the first 5 years of my life in Oak Ridge, Tennessee. My father was a nuclear engineer and metallurgist. And my parents even saved souvenirs from the Atomic Energy Museum in their safe deposit box for the four daughters. And they--we found them when they died. Anyway, very strange. But he--I did hear a lot of talk about nuclear weapon production around my house and my father changed his mind over the years quite

drastically. But I live in Atlanta. I'm a board member of Atlanta WAND, Women's Action for New Directions. And I'm also on the national board of the WAND education fund. Another organization I'm active with is Atlanta chapter of the United Nations Association. And this organization was founded shortly after the formation of the United Nations, which was founded shortly after World War II, which--and shortly after the dropping of the bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. And the aim of the United Nations was to prevent any further world wars and I would say probably the use of more nuclear weapons. I think it was realized by everyone the devastation that they caused.

It was horrible. I wish to draw attention to the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. I also have an interest in that because of the United Nations and we made a commitment in 1968 to implement irreversible nuclear weapons reduction. And I know that was discussed in this slide presentation but I also think that the production of new weapons does not--is not really holding to that promise. There--we had a hundred and eighty-eight other signatories on the treaties and I don't think it sends a very good message to say, well, we're just kind of making some new ones here, we're going to dismantle some and make some more,

and smaller usable ones, whatever. I just think that is a do-as-I-say-not-as-I-do kind of international--approach to international relations and I don't think it works. I think that we need to set an example. I think the nuclear posture review--I know that that's the--what you have to follow, but there's going to be a change, as Tom Clements said, and I think that this plan is going to be defunct. I certainly hope so. The idea of a first-strike weapon is not a very good message to send to the world. We could actually lead the world in reducing the nuclear threat and take the bold step of ratifying the Comprehensive Test-ban Treaty. These are Cold War weapons. They cannot help us in Iraq or Afghanistan. We cannot even--we can't even keep track of the ones we have. Six cruise missiles armed with nuclear warheads were loaded on a plane in August and they were lost for 2 days. We didn't know where they were. So I just think we need to work on tracking them down and dismantling them all and not making any new ones. In an article from the Wall Street Journal from January 15th, 2008, a year after a similar article was printed--there was one in 2007--U.S. leaders--I'll name them in a minute--were compelled to call for a global effort to reduce our reliance on nuclear weapons, to prevent their spread

into potentially dangerous hands and ultimately to end them as a threat to the world. The leaders were George P. Schultz, Secretary of State from 1982 to '89; William Perry, Secretary of Defense from 1994 to '97; Henry Kissinger--I didn't put his dates down, but everybody knows Henry Kissinger. He was not a plain liberal Democrat wacko. Former Senator Sam Nunn, former chair of the Senate Armed Services Committee. The article quotes Mikhail Gorbachev, who wrote in January 2007--and he was one of the signatories on the treaties, that it is becoming clearer that nuclear weapons are no longer a means of achieving security. In fact, with every passing year they make our security more precarious. These leaders have received support from many other leaders who have served as Secretaries of State and defense and national security advisors from Republican and Democratic administrations. We need to focus on living up to our treaties, getting rid of nuclear weapons and setting an example in the world. We don't need this expensive, polluting, dangerous project. We do need transformation, transformation that would clean up the millions of gallons of Cold War weapons waste, dismantle the weapons we have and becoming a nation that the rest of the world can look up to and start us on the path to keeping our word.

And that's all I have to say.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Our next speaker is John Lindsey. Mr. Lindsey will be followed by Ernie Chaput and H.R. Jobe.

MR. LINDSEY: Hello. I'm John Lindsey. And I'm here to say that maybe capacity-limited plan is the best approach. Today we have 2,000 nuclear weapons and 10,000 pits in storage. Isn't that a euphemism? Pits, what is that? That's basically--oh, if I understand correctly, it's a--it explodes but it's not in a warhead. The defense budget in this country is currently larger than the entire rest of the world. And why? Is it because of war profiteering? What makes us want to be that large? And who are we going to use these 10,000 pits against? It's mind-boggling. In the '60s we built a fallout shelter in our basement. Why? Because we had been sold that fear is what we needed. We do not need fear today nor did we need it in the '60s. We need to move on. And that's all I have to say.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Our next speaker is Ernie Chaput to be followed by H.R. Jobe and Hildy Lindsey.

MR. CHAPUT: Good evening. My name is Ernie Chaput. I'm the director of Special Projects for the Economic Development Partnership here in Aiken, South Carolina. We in South Carolina and Aiken area thank the DOE for the opportunity to provide comment on the very important matters that are contained in this draft Supplemental PEIS, matters which will determine the well-being of the nation's nuclear defense shield through the rest of this decade or the rest of the century, I mean. And by that--is every time you pick up the newspaper or listen to TV you come to the realization this is still a dangerous world. We need to defend ourselves and we need to have an array of options for defending ourselves against potential enemies large and small. And we believe that a nuclear option is a part of that defense shield. We have three comments to offer on the draft Supplemental PEIS. First, we strongly support DOE's objectives of the transition to a smaller, more efficient, more secure and more responsive nuclear weapons complex. Many facilities in the complex were established to support a nuclear stockpile containing several tens of thousands of weapons and with new designs being introduced into that stockpile every year the future stockpile will be much smaller with a fewer number of weapons types being

produced and supported. There's many budgetary and operational efficiencies which can be achieved by modernizing and sizing the future weapons complex to more closely meet this expected need. In preparing to meet the future need we recommend that DOE a very long-term planning approach and provide facilities and other capabilities which will be adequate to meet a range of defense needs for at least the next 50 or 60 years. Don't do it on the cheap. As the Framm man said, you can pay me now or pay me later. Our second comment is we're very pleased that one of DOE's preferred alternatives is to consolidate tritium research and development at Savannah River Site. Tritium has been a hallmark of SRS since the '50s. We in the community join with our SRS neighbors in taking pride in the site's enviable production record while maintaining excellence in public safety, environmental protection and worker safety. The community stands ready to assist DOE in achieving an efficient and seamless transition for these R&D activities. Third comment is we support the concept of distributed centers of excellence. However, we continue to have a concern about the Department's lack of commitment to providing an adequate capability to meet the long-term needs for manufacture of plutonium pits. The draft EIS

includes many positive statements that a need exists to manufacture 125 pits per year on the single-shift basis, implying that the new Consolidated Plutonium Center is required, yet the preferred alternative only supports about 50 pits per year, again single shift, in the old and heavily modified TA-55 facilities. Rather than spending large sums of scarce fiscal resources in the ill-suited TA-55 we believe these funds should be invested in a modern manufacturing facility of adequate size and capabilities to meet the nation's needs for many decades. Fiscal responsibility and national security will better be served by taking a long-range view. EDP, my organization, is proud of the vibrant and extensive nuclear infrastructure which exists in our region, both for national security and national--and energy security purposes. This capability includes the nation's only production-scale plutonium infrastructure. These physical and intellectual assets combined with the supportive working relationship between DOE and our community will serve DOE and NNSA well for many years to come. Again, thanks for the opportunity to provide these comments.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Okay. Our next speaker will be H.R. Jobe to be followed by Hildy Lindsey and Glenn Carroll.

MR. JOBE: I'm H.R. Jobe. I'm the oldest one here tonight. I've watched the nuclear explosions from China when they first started in 1960--50--45--it's '45--'45. And I watched the wars as they've happened. I've spent time in a lot of these areas. I apologize. I didn't intend to do any talking here tonight but I just had to say something. The movements that we're going to be going through it's just like going through for any kind of war effort. I've been in many countries. I've worked in many countries. And I--there are many countries that I can't--I can't walk in because there's carpet bombing. What kind of testing are we going to do with the nuclear system? And I just returned from Cambodia. Cambodia is still having to live with the carpet bombing that we did there. And Pol Pot completely killed one third of this whole population because he was--he wanted to get people straightened out. I don't see in anything here but an action on the part of the military to spend more money to try to stay ahead of the world destructive conditions. One final thought--one place that I was involved, it was--I helped design the factory in Khartoum that the United States had bombed with a nuclear--with a cruise missile. Everywhere I go in the

world I see the United States military suppressing people. Is this what we're going to be doing here with the nuclear system? I think so. And I'm worried about it for that reason. It's got to be slowed down. We are--we're pushing too fast here. If we don't need this thing why do we spend money on it? How many people are--are in the nuclear business today? Count them. Starting out with the United States, Russia, England, France, North Korea. Now look at how many more do we have to--oh, Israel is in that one, too. How many more do we have? What we're trying to do is a battle to see who is going to stay ahead of everybody else in this nuclear world. And I think this is wrong.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Our next speaker is Hildy Lindsey to be followed by Glenn Carroll and Eddie Bussey.

MS. LINDSEY: I'm Hildy Lindsey. I think nuclear weapons are obscene. I think we have much better things to spend our money on, like cleaning up the Savannah River Site, getting the tritium out of the well water. And I think we should rethink this, ask the question again what does the population want.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Let's call on Glenn Carroll and she'll be followed by Eddie Bussey and Clint Wolfe.

MS. CARROLL: Thank you. My name is Glenn Carroll. I represent Nuclear Watch South. I would like to thank you, Ted, for--you've put in a long day and been exemplary. This has been a very well-run meeting. I became an environmentalist 20 years ago. Chernobyl happened and I had a little bit of understanding of nuclear and I knew that if the inside of a reactor got out, which just wasn't supposed to happen, it would be more radiation on the surface of the earth than we had experienced before and we ought not experiment with it. It happened. I got involved. It coincided rather nicely with the end of the Cold War. So all of a sudden the bomb was an environmental problem. We had waste at the bomb complexes around the country. And I never had to think about the bomb. And I was still a baby activist when Complex 21 came up and we went out and we had a righteous time. As I recall then the people came out and sang and danced and read poems and laughed and clapped and said we don't want the bomb. It kind of went away again. And then the Modern Pit Facility came up and by then I had become more of a leader. I had to write fact sheets and, you know, I had to think about it. And along in there I

went to Savannah River Site for the first time because we took on the plutonium MOX factory and I knew it just wouldn't hold if I said, oh, I'm afraid I'll get radiated and I never went out, you know, to see the site. So I went out to the site and we had a jolly time on the bus and when I got home I was like, okay, what happened there. What did you see? You know, this had been an abstract idea in your mind for all these years and you saw it. But I think the biggest impact was seeing the size of the buildings. And I had heard the numbers. I knew we had 20,000 people that worked there at one point. And I think at that point it was about 11,000 people. And more than the bomb, more than using the bomb--I never thought about all the international politics and everything--it was look how many people are hooked on making the bomb. And that seemed harder to me to get--I mean here at Savannah River we've got tens of thousands. All over the country the designers--this is just a production site of things. This isn't the military. And I really--you know, that was kind of hard to think about. How do you take care of that many people that are hooked on an enterprise that won't hold, that we can't do anymore? Well, I guess the good news there is the nuclear waste and we beg and plead that that will be what we will do.

So I wanted to--appreciate your listening to me twice today. And I want to talk a little bit more in particular about this EIS process and hopefully get you some comments that will be usable to you. I hear what you say, that the EIS that's associated--you have conceptually linked it to the question is what are we going to do about the bomb complex. It needs some work. So you rejected 32,000 comments from the public that said the alternative to the proposal should be to look at disarmament. And I would put forth to you that NEPA it demands that the EIS be an objective look that helps to make an informed decision so you must de-couple it. It's not a mandate to find a way to do it. It's a mandate to look at it objectively and thoroughly so that you can make an informed decision. We've been to these hearings. It's overwhelming. We've only had one comment today in support of this enterprise. This cannot be denied. I appreciate your acknowledging that there were some campaigns reflected in the 32,000 comments and you counted some twenty similar messages. Mr. Wyka also told me personally that every single message was analyzed. If the third paragraph was different that was noted. And that is really heartening. I want to go on record, as you listen respectfully to me, and say that every message

that was sent reflects a person who was aware, who contemplated a message and expended their energy to send a message and it cannot discount that person's participation and message in this if it was not completely handwritten. The NEPA requires that you analyze all impacts of the proposed project and therefore use of nuclear weapons must be analyzed in the impact on the environment. There's economic aspects that have to be analyzed under NEPA. We need to look at how we could better serve people's need with \$150 billion and I would include in that the need to clean up nuclear waste and develop the technologies to deal with it.

MR. LAWSON: How much time did you need? You're up to 7 minutes.

MS. CARROLL: I'm pretty close.

MR. LAWSON: Okay. Thank you.

MS. CARROLL: The people did demand disarmament be looked at. And so, as I said before--well, let me back up. You've described to us what Congress and the President are about in setting up this idea that we're talking about now. But this is the people. And 32,000 people trumps the President and the Congress. And, you know, we have a couple of elected officials participate here today and they are welcome to do that. But, you

know, that's how they can be involved in the EIS is by participating. So, you know, whatever they're doing does not suggest one iota what conclusion you're going to find by going through the EIS process. They can want these buildings with all their heart and that can have no influence. And further, it's important to point out that the bomb that we were going to make there funding got canceled for that this year. So there's a disconnect. And we're spending money to have this little party here right now for a weapon that's currently not being funded. My notes are kind of scribbly so I--look at them.

MR. LAWSON: Would you like to come back after other people have spoken?

MS. CARROLL: Well, just this--two quick points, that Savannah River Site is being looked at for here would be a Consolidated Plutonium Center. I want to point out that a programmatic EIS we went through in the '90s was for plutonium MOX fuel. Savannah River Site was selected and there's a wonderful boondoggle unfolding. It's now 13 years on now and we don't have a MOX factory but we sure do have plutonium. And it is stored here. And I put forth that we could be stepping in it again, building another storage shed for more

plutonium. There are a lot of replacement warheads that have been canceled. It's not being funded. So we could just end up with a whole 'nother pile of plutonium. So be warned. And my final point--sorry. I'm tired, too, and didn't finish. The people demanded disarmament. You got 32,000 comments. The EIS is in error to not have analyzed disarmament. You were overwhelmingly charged by the people to look at that. Maybe it doesn't pan out, but you're supposed to look at it. And I will put forth in support of other commenters today that Article 6 of our Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty demands that we disarm. And I will conclude by acknowledging that the World Court found the possession, manufacture and use of nuclear weapons illegal in 1996. So we are clearly outside of international law at this time. Thank you very much.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker is Eddie Bussey to be followed by Clint Wolfe and Harry Rogers.

MR. BUSSEY: Good evening. My name is Eddie Bussey. I'm here to represent the SRS Community Reuse Organization. I will be reading a letter stating our position here this evening.

On behalf of the SRS Community Reuse Organization I am pleased to submit this letter of support regarding the Complex Transformation EIS and the proposed role of

the Savannah River site in the reconfigured nuclear weapons complex. At the Department of Energy's designated Community Reuse Organization the SRS CRO is a 501(c)(3) private non-profit organization. The SRS CRO is charged with developing and implementing a comprehensive strategy to diversify the economy of the five-county region in the Central Savannah River Area of Georgia and South Carolina. We are governed by a twenty-two member Board of Directors composed of business and government and academic leaders from Georgia and South Carolina. As proposed in the Complex Transformation SPEIS, the Savannah River Site would become the center of excellence for operations involving large quantities of tritium. We welcome this important mission that is vital to our national security. The Savannah River Site has a long and distinguished history of tritium production performed by a highly skilled and dedicated workforce. We are committed to advanced hydrogen research and development, as evidenced by investments in the Center for Hydrogen Research located adjacent to SRS in Aiken County. Thank you for allowing our voice to be heard and to participate in this meeting.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. The next speaker is Clint Wolfe to be followed by Harry Rogers.

MR. WOLFE: Good evening. I'm Clint Wolfe, executive director of Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness, otherwise known as CNTA. As the nation's largest citizen-based program we are an education and advocacy group with about 2,000 members and 40 corporate and business sponsors. And we thank you and we're pleased to have the opportunity to comment on your NNSA's consolidation plans. We fully support NNSA's plans to consolidate and modernize the nation's weapons facilities. This should make the complex more efficient, safer and environmentally more responsible. It should also give the NNSA the flexibility it needs to respond to changing defense needs. We applaud NNSA's decision already made to consolidate non-weapon plutonium at SRS in which surplus plutonium will be processed and then disposed of off-site. The mixed oxide and disassembly and diversion facility you mentioned are already targeted for SRS. We also believe, however, that SRS would be the best location to meet the need to manufacture new replacement pits, supported by research from the Savannah River National Laboratory and Los Alamos National Laboratory. SRS has a 55-year history of production excellence. It has met every shipment date and every product specification in

its tritium and plutonium missions. Los Alamos' history of excellence is in research, not production. I have great respect for Los Alamos, having started my nuclear career there, and have enjoyed many collaborations with colleagues there. However, we are concerned that there will be little strength capacity at Los Alamos. One does not go from one shift to three shifts without months of training of appropriately skilled people. Production facilities designed for their intended purpose are inherently more efficient than piece work performed in aging facilities designed for other purposes. We do not believe it is in the best interest of Los Alamos or the nation for Los Alamos to assume this meticulous production role. This is one experiment that we cannot afford to have Los Alamos conduct. Our organization--excuse me--our organization, Citizens for Nuclear Technology Awareness, our elected officials and the citizens of this area are very supportive of national defense missions at SRS. I think you will find our record of support is unmatched anywhere in the country. This is one more reason why SRS should be the site of choice for pit production. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The last person I have on

my list is Harry Rogers.

MR. ROGERS: I guess that means I get an hour and a half. I'm Harry Rogers. I'm with the Carolina--the past nuclear energy coordinator for the Carolina Peace Resource Center. I'm a past board member of the Alliance of Nuclear Accountability. I worked at V.C. Summer Nuclear Generating Station and I'm a Vietnam veteran--grandfather, too. The last time I was here was a comment on the environmental impact statement for the pit production and what I submitted was a series of statements by almost all the major religious groups detailing the immorality of both the use and the threatened use of nuclear weapons. So to make sure that I get it in is--and Tom Clements has said it, is what it's going to analyze is disarmament, which is morally what the United--morally and legally what the United States should be doing. We've already mentioned Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. I didn't come back for a couple of these hearings 'cause I was so discouraged by--I listened to a couple of religious leaders from this community talking about the economic stimulus of bringing nuclear weapons production to this community. Well, you know, in my understanding of

Christ they may be pastors of churches but they're certainly not followers of Christ. And that's what's missing from the environmental impact statement is that when are we going to finally meet our moral obligation and legal obligation and spiritual obligation to end the use of nuclear weapons. This environmental impact statement assumes the long-term reliance on nuclear weapons. If you're relying on nuclear weapons then certainly there's a threat. And if you don't think that nuclear weapons threatens you--it's not terrorism, maybe you don't understand terrorism. And I don't want my country to terrorize the world. Tom mentioned a nuclear posture review. It's important to note that not only is that not nuclear posture review, to say that we would use--we would use nuclear weapons as a first strike, it also defined its use against non-nuclear weapons states. Now, remember this is the only county that has--that has actually used nuclear weapons against a population. So you had the nuclear posture review in 2001 that says not only have we used them--listen up, world, we'll use them again. It's sobering and that's something that this community should think about when we come out here and we tout that we need this--we need this facility here for economic development. I submit to you that it's no

different than Germans in 1939 and 1940 asking the gas oven--gas chambers be built in their communities. I want to finish with--I supported the Actinide package and storage facility here at Savannah River Site. I supported cleanup missions here. I went to Washington and I lobbied for money to spend at the Savannah River Site. But I can tell you I'm here and I needed to come back here to testify again that nuclear weapons are evil. And for you to be asking for this as economic development calls for you to look into your heart and ask yourselves what--what is motivating me and what kind of country do I want. In closing, I just--I just want to demand that we--that an Environmental Impact Statement does two things. And we asked for this in the pit production. Is if you're going to built pits for nuclear weapons then certainly in that impact statement you've got to discuss if that pit is used what happens. It's not in here. And the other thing is you have to include in that Environmental Impact Statement the possibility of disarmament, as others before me have said, which was demanded by thousands of people of conscience. Thank you.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Okay. Since we have a little time left just--and I did call people on their timing, is there anyone who spoke who would like to

have a little more time? Is there anybody who is here now who knows now that they would like to speak but have not signed up yet? Okay. So what we're going to do, we're going to take a recess. We're going to be here until 10:00 this evening. You're certainly welcome to stay around in case we have other people or you yourself would like to make another comment. Yes, sir?

MR. ROGERS: I'd like to just make one more comment, if I would.

MR. LAWSON: Okay, fine.

MR. ROGERS: I think it's also important to know is that this administration has threatened us with another \$2 trillion war over the allegation of another country wanting to produce nuclear weapons. And we remind you that uranium enrichment is not by treaty illegal. So I ask you all to look at the hypocrisy involved in us talking about creating a new generation of nuclear weapons where we're threatening another sovereign nation for I presume a legal enterprise. And I don't want them to have uranium enrichment and nonproliferation does concern me. But U.S. hypocrisy concerns me also.

MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Okay. As I was saying, I'm going to now take a recess and we'll be in recess

until or unless we have one or more people who would like to come up and--and make a statement. And then we'll open the process as we have it now. For those of you--we'd like to have you stay around. If you'd like to talk to some of the officials here you're certainly welcome to do that. We welcome you staying. But if you choose not to I want to thank you very much for the time in coming out tonight, especially for the effort in putting together the statements that you've made. I know they're very much appreciated and will be weighed seriously in Washington. This meeting right now is in recess. Thank you.

[Recess 8:40 - 9:45 p.m.]

MR. LAWSON: It is now nearly ten o'clock and we have not had any other people who have come up and asked to give oral or written testimony. So I'm going to give closing comments. I want to thank the people here, especially at the North Augusta Community Center, for hosting the site and the hearing today. And I want to thank everyone who participated for that participation and their comments. I would also note that people may continue to submit their comments on the SPEIS until the comment period closes on April 10.

This then concludes this hearing on the Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement for Complex

Transformation program. And this hearing is adjourned
at 9:55 p.m.

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

//

CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER

I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript consisting of pages numbered 2 through 42 is a true and correct transcript of the proceeding held before me; that said hearing was reported by the method of Stenomask.

I further certify that I am not kin or counsel to the parties in the case, am not in the regular employ of counsel or said parties, nor am I otherwise interested in the result of said case.

This the 19th day of March, 2008.

GINA L. SMITH, CCR, CVR

CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER

GEORGIA CERTIFICATE # B-2151