

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

SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

GLOBE-NEWS CENTER

EDUCATION ROOM

500 S. BUCHANAN

AMARILLO, TEXAS

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 2008

7:00 P.M. TO 10:00 P.M.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

.

APPEARANCES

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

FACILITATOR:

Mr. Barry R. Lawson, Ph.D.
Barry Lawson Associates
P.O. Box 26
Peacham, Vermont 05862

FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY:

Mr. Theodore A. Wyka
Complex 2030 SEIS Document Manager
Office of Transformation
U.S. Department of Energy, NA-10.1
1000 Independence Avenue, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20585

I N D E X

PAGE

SPEAKERS:

LON BURNAM -----	10
SUSAN GORDON -----	16
SCOTT KOVAC -----	24
ALLEN FINEGOLD -----	29

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE -----	36
------------------------------	----

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

1 MR. LAWSON: Well, good evening, and
2 thank you all for taking time to participate in this
3 important public hearing on the National Nuclear
4 Security Administration's Supplementary Programmatic
5 Environmental Impact Statement, a Supplemental PEIS for
6 the transformation of the nation's nuclear weapons
7 complex.

8 I know a number of you were here this
9 afternoon, I see a few new faces, so bear with us as we
10 go through our opening comments and our presentations.

11 I hope that you've had an adequate
12 opportunity to browse the displays and talk to the
13 project staff during the just completed open house, and
14 there will be plenty of opportunity this evening if you
15 have not already.

16 My name is Barry Lawson and I'm pleased to
17 serve as moderator for this hearing. My roles tonight
18 are to ensure that there are opportunities for you to --
19 to not only attend the hearing, but to obtain
20 information about the proposed program and provide your
21 comments and make sure that everyone observes a few
22 basic ground rules, which have been intended purely to
23 provide a fair and respectful participation by all of
24 you.

25 If you signed in at the registration table

1 you should have received a participant's packet, which
2 contains information on the transformation of the
3 nuclear weapons complex.

4 There are two parts to this hearing. The
5 informal segment began with the open house and continues
6 after my remarks with a brief welcome video from
7 Mr. Robert Smolen, who is the Deputy Administrator for
8 Defense Programs, and then a 20 minute presentation by
9 Ted Wyka, the Supplemental PEIS Document Manager.
10 Mr. Wyka will discuss the complex transformation project
11 and the contents of the PEIS.

12 The formal segment will begin following
13 his presentation, and during that segment members of the
14 public will be called to make oral comments on the PEIS,
15 the court reporter will then begin making a verbatim
16 transcript of your comments.

17 There will be no exchange of questions and
18 answers. The NNSA officials will be here to listen to
19 your comments, but will not be engaging in dialogue
20 during the formal segment.

21 If you wish to make an oral comment during
22 the formal comment segment you will need to have signed
23 up at the registration table if you haven't done so
24 already.

25 I will be recognizing speakers as their

1 names appear on the registration list that will be
2 provided to me at the beginning of that formal segment.

3 The ground rules for speakers providing
4 additional information or providing oral comments are
5 during the formal session you will have allotted up to
6 five minutes each to make your comments.

7 Now, when I was last at the registration
8 table we had three people who had signed up, so I can
9 bend that a little bit, but we never know when people
10 are going to be coming in later, so hopefully we can
11 get -- have you be as concise as possible and to the
12 point related to the PEIS, but certainly if you need a
13 little more time I'm not going to bug you about that.

14 If you do have a longer written statement,
15 I would ask you to summarize those comments orally and
16 then submit the written document in its entirety.

17 And as I said, if you think that you will
18 need more time, just let me know. If we get an onrush
19 of people coming in, I can certainly provide more time
20 to you after everyone has had his or her first
21 opportunity to speak.

22 Well, that's it for the agenda and the
23 hearing format. Are there any questions about how we're
24 organized tonight?

25 Great. Again, I thank you in advance for

1 your cooperation in making this a productive and
2 respectful hearing and I look forward to your comments.

3 And now for the eight minute video,
4 followed by Mr. Wyka's presentation.

5 (Video presentation by Mr. Robert Smolen,
6 (followed by oral presentation by Ted
7 (Wyka.

8 MR. LAWSON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wyka.
9 If you'll bear with me for a minute or two, I'll read
10 into the record for verbatim transcription my
11 introductory remarks for the public comment hearing.

12 This portion of our hearing is officially
13 designated as the Pantex Public Hearing for the National
14 Security -- National Nuclear Security Administration's
15 Supplemental PEIS for the Complex Transformation
16 Program.

17 This hearing is being held on February
18 28th in the Amarillo Globe-News Center. It is being
19 held to receive comments on the content of this
20 supplemental PEIS.

21 We are commenting the public comment
22 portion of this hearing at 7:40 p.m. and are scheduled
23 to adjourn once all participants have had a chance to
24 make their comments or at 10:00 o'clock at the latest.

25 Each speaker will have a maximum of five

1 minutes, but as I indicated earlier, I will be somewhat
2 flexible on that. We will begin with elected Federal or
3 State officials, if there are any.

4 This hearing was preceded by a
5 presentation by NNSA's PEIS Document Manager, Mr. Ted
6 Wyka. Mr. Wyka will represent the Administration in
7 listening to and accepting your comments.

8 For the record, again, my name is Barry
9 Lawson. I've been asked by NNSA to conduct this comment
10 period as an independent and neutral moderator and I
11 will ensure that the ground rules reviewed earlier in
12 the evening are followed.

13 Our court reporter this evening is Brenda
14 Rohrs. Mr. Rohrs' task is to create a complete and
15 accurate transcription of this hearing.

16 NNSA will place copies of the transcript
17 from this and other public hearings in its Freedom of
18 Information Act designated reading rooms as soon as
19 possible.

20 If you wish to make oral comments tonight
21 you must have first signed up at the registration table.
22 I will recognize speakers in the order in which they
23 registered, as I indicated before.

24 Please remain in the room if you're
25 scheduled to speak. I will be calling three speakers at

1 a time, and at the moment I only have three speakers, so
2 that you'll have some warning before you speak. Please
3 move toward the front of the room to the podium when
4 it's your turn to speak.

5 If you are approaching the time limit, I
6 would normally give you a signal, asking you to
7 summarize your remaining comments, but as I indicated
8 before, we'll be somewhat flexible on that unless we
9 have a number of people coming in.

10 If necessary, which will probably be true,
11 I will call a recess, during which we will set aside
12 formal proceedings until we have other people who would
13 like to speak.

14 I would just ask you, if you have any
15 conversations, to conduct them outside of this room, and
16 I would ask you if you could take a moment to shut off
17 any cell phones that you may have.

18 Commenters are recommended to state their
19 name for the court reporter's record, and if you have a
20 written copy of your comments or if you have a written
21 document you would like to submit, please bring it to me
22 after you have spoken.

23 Written materials will be formally
24 accepted into the record as exhibits to this hearing, in
25 addition to oral comments and, importantly, written

1 comments and oral comments are weighed equally by the
2 Administration.

3 A final reminder that you may submit
4 comments up to and including April 10 of this year, and
5 there's no limitation on the number or the length of
6 comments any individual may submit.

7 All right. With those preliminaries out
8 of the way, we can begin. As I indicated I have three
9 speakers. Our first speaker will be Lon Burnam, and
10 Mr. Burnam will be followed by Susan Gordon and Scott
11 Kovac.

12 MR. BURNAM: Good evening. As the
13 facilitator said, my name is Lon Burnam. I'm a six term
14 State Representative from Fort Worth.

15 In about 45 years ago this spring, the
16 spring of 1963, before President Kennedy was
17 assassinated, I was sitting in my local Southern Baptist
18 church in worship service on Sunday evening and heard a
19 missionary describe in graphic detail an experience he
20 had 18 years earlier on the outskirts of Hiroshima. I
21 heard the description of the results of actually using
22 one of these bombs.

23 Maybe I was a little young to have heard
24 that. It certainly seared my consciousness and my
25 awareness that any time we're talking about making

1 something, we're talking about the possibility of using
2 it, and in this case we're talking about obliterating a
3 city and its population.

4 A few years later, in high school, I was
5 the organizer of my Earth Day activities, the first
6 Earth Day, 1970.

7 By that time I was very clear of the
8 interrelatedness between the nuclear weapons race and
9 the use of nuclear power in this country and the
10 tradeoffs we were making.

11 Fast forward several years later, I'm the
12 director of the Dallas Peace Center. I live in
13 Fort Worth and I have always lived in Fort Worth, and I
14 live in that community in order to be able to do the
15 work that I think is so important, and certainly
16 opposing violating international peace treaties, such as
17 being proposed here tonight, is theoretically in my job
18 description.

19 But unlike a lot of you, I'm here on my
20 own nickel and my own time because I think it is so
21 important that we have this conversation and dialogue.

22 As I wrap up my comments I'm going to read
23 straight from Friends Committee on National Legislation,
24 comments about what we're facing, because I think
25 they're succinct and to the point and those five

1 paragraphs should be in the record.

2 I want to start with two general concerns
3 about these proceedings. The first is the location of
4 the 19 hearings.

5 By definition in the earlier presentation,
6 these hearings are near the facilities. These
7 facilities, it is not desirable for them to be near
8 major urban settings.

9 I represent an inner-city, urban district
10 of 150,000 people. An overwhelming majority of these
11 people are people of color and an overwhelming majority
12 of these people do not have access to health insurance.

13 So when we talk about the morality of
14 \$150 billion expenditure to violate international law,
15 to expedite a new nuclear weapons race, I want to ask
16 you what I'm going to tell my constituents about why
17 they don't have access to health care.

18 Second point that I want to make
19 concerning these proceedings, by that very location,
20 again, it's the people with economic interest that show
21 up, to promote job creations in the community that are
22 here, not the people that I represent. That's location.

23 Now let's talk about the product itself.
24 I have a graduate degree in city and regional planning.
25 Drilled into my head over and over again, semester after

1 semester, any decent planning process will provide the
2 decision-makers at least five options.

3 This proposal is fundamentally flawed and
4 anybody completing a graduate course in city and
5 regional planning, or any planning program, would know
6 that because it only provides you with four options.
7 The fifth option is deliberately and systematically left
8 out.

9 You have, required by NEPA, the no action,
10 but the fifth obvious is no -- build no new nuclear
11 weapons, and that's deliberately left out of this
12 process.

13 You know, 12 of the 14 people that
14 testified at the afternoon hearings were all against
15 this.

16 We all recognize that there's some
17 advantage to reducing the footprint, there's some
18 advantage to increasing security, but all 12 of us
19 recognize that what this really is about, the bottom
20 line in this whole process, is adding new nuclear
21 weapons.

22 We heard from people from Pax Christi,
23 from the Unitarian Universalist Fellowship, we heard a
24 letter read from Bishop Matthiesen, Catholic Bishop
25 retired here in the Amarillo area, and we heard Patsy's

1 story.

2 Patsy's story is about one of those people
3 like so many of my constituents, that because of the
4 misappropriation of resources in this country we have
5 one of the worst health care systems of any
6 industrialized country in the world and we are a
7 renegade maverick in encouraging a new nuclear weapons
8 race, in violation of international law.

9 I would call to your attention
10 particularly the comments by Susan Gordon of the
11 Alliance of Nuclear Accountability.

12 I know she's going to feel like it's
13 deja vu all over again by the time she finishes showing
14 up at so many of these hearings, but she makes the
15 points dead on from a scientific basis that what you're
16 talking about is wrong and it's inappropriate.

17 From the Friends Committee on National
18 Legislation, which is obviously a national organization
19 advocating legislation and national public policy, it is
20 very clear, they ask the question: What is complex
21 transformation.

22 The plan includes a new bomb plant that
23 would enable the mass production of nuclear weapons for
24 the first time in two decades.

25 What happened to the Complex 2030? The

1 bomb plant proposed as a part of Complex 2030 was much
2 larger than the one proposed by complex transformation
3 and that one was rejected by Congress in 2007.

4 There are five paragraphs from the
5 description in detail of what we're really talking about
6 tonight.

7 The plan includes construction of bombs,
8 mass produced nuclear weapons. You know, we started a
9 war over the alleged existence of weapons of mass
10 destruction five years ago. Many maintain that that was
11 a violation of international law.

12 The underlying premise of international
13 efforts to stop the spread of weapons of mass
14 destruction is that the United States and other nuclear
15 weapon states would also work toward disarmament.
16 Building the next generation of nuclear weapons
17 factories takes the United States in the opposite
18 direction.

19 The new plan also threatens U.S. and
20 international security by undermining calls for Iran and
21 North Korea to halt their nuclear program.

22 This plan is totally inadequate, this plan
23 is not comprehensive and this plan takes us on a path
24 towards violating further international law.

25 Thank you for your time.

1 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir.

2 THE REPORTER: May I have one second?

3 MR. LAWSON: Sure. Our next speaker will
4 be Susan Gordon. If you would just hold off for one
5 second, Ms. Gordon.

6 MS. GORDON: My name is Susan --

7 MR. LAWSON: Are we all set?

8 MS. GORDON: Are you ready?

9 THE REPORTER: Yes.

10 MS. GORDON: Great. My name is Susan
11 Gordon and I'm the director of the Alliance for Nuclear
12 Accountability, and the Alliance for Nuclear
13 Accountability is a 20-year-old organization that
14 represents the communities that live next door to the
15 nuclear weapons complex sites.

16 So our communities are very much impacted
17 by the proposals of the past to the weapons complex, as
18 well as those proposed for the future.

19 What I want to enter into the record is
20 the statement made by George Shultz, William Perry,
21 Henry Kissinger and Sam Nunn in the Wall Street Journal
22 in January of this year.

23 And what they are doing is proposing a
24 multiple step process towards a world without nuclear
25 weapons. And I won't read all of it, but there are some

1 key components that I would like to be sure are part of
2 the record.

3 The accelerating spread of nuclear
4 weapons, nuclear know-how and nuclear material has
5 brought us to a nuclear tipping point. We face the very
6 real possibility that the deadliest weapons ever
7 invented could fall into dangerous hands.

8 The steps we are taking now to address
9 these threats are not adequate to the danger. With
10 nuclear weapons more widely available, deterrence is
11 decreasingly effective and increasingly hazardous.

12 One year ago, in an essay in this paper,
13 we called for a global effort to reduce reliance on
14 nuclear weapons, to prevent their spread into
15 potentially dangerous hands, and ultimately to end them
16 as a threat to the world.

17 The interest, momentum and growing
18 political space that has been created to address these
19 issues over the past year has been extraordinary, with
20 strong positive responses from people all over the
21 world.

22 Mikhail Gorbachev wrote in January 2007
23 that, as someone who signed the first treaties on real
24 reductions in nuclear weapons, he thought it his duty to
25 support our call for urgent action. Quote, it is

1 becoming clearer that nuclear weapons are no longer a
2 means of achieving security; in fact, with every passing
3 year they make our security more precarious.

4 In June, the United Kingdom's foreign
5 secretary, Margaret Beckett, signaled her government's
6 support, stating, what we need is both a vision, a
7 scenario for a world free of nuclear weapons, and
8 action, progressive steps to reduce warhead numbers and
9 to limit the role of nuclear weapons in security policy.
10 These two strands are separate, but they are mutually
11 reinforcing. Both are necessary, but at the moment too
12 weak.

13 We have also been encouraged by additional
14 indications of general support for this project from
15 other former U.S. officials with extensive experience as
16 secretaries of state and defense and national security
17 advisors. These include Madeleine Albright, Richard V.
18 Allen, James A. Baker, III, Samuel Berger -- I don't
19 know how to say his name -- Zbigniew --

20 MR. LAWSON: Zbigniew Brzezinski.

21 MS. GORDON: Thank you. Frank Carlucci,
22 Warren Christopher, William Cohen, Lawrence Eagleburger,
23 Melvin Laird, Anthony Lake, Robert McFarlane, Robert
24 McNamara and Colin Powell.

25 So just summarizing a little bit more of

1 what they've written, they held a conference in October
2 last year and brought together people at the Hoover
3 Institute.

4 And the statement coming out of that is
5 that the U.S. and Russia, which possesses close to 95
6 percent of the world's nuclear warheads, have a special
7 responsibility, obligation and experience to demonstrate
8 leadership, but other nations must join.

9 And then they line out a number of steps
10 to get to a world without nuclear weapons and say,
11 again, in parallel with these steps by the U.S. and
12 Russia, the dialogue must broaden on an international
13 scale, including non-nuclear as well as nuclear nations.

14 Key subjects include turning the goal of a
15 world without nuclear weapons into a practical
16 enterprise among nations by applying the necessary
17 political will to build an international consensus on
18 priorities.

19 The government of Norway will sponsor a
20 conference in February that will contribute to this
21 process. And that actually has been happening in Norway
22 over the last two days, all of these very important
23 people have been there.

24 There should also be an agreement to
25 undertake further substantial reductions in U.S. and

1 Russian nuclear forces beyond those recorded in the
2 U.S.-Russia Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty. As
3 the reductions proceed, other nuclear nations would
4 become involved.

5 President Reagan's maxim of trust but
6 verify should be reaffirmed. Completing a verifiable
7 treaty to prevent nations from producing nuclear
8 materials for weapons would contribute to a more
9 rigorous system of accounting and security for nuclear
10 materials.

11 We should also build an international
12 consensus on ways to deter or, when required, to respond
13 to secret attempts by countries to break out of
14 agreements.

15 Progress must be facilitated by a clear
16 statement of our ultimate goal. Indeed, this is the
17 only way to build the kind of international trust and
18 broad cooperation that will be required to effectively
19 address today's threats. Without the vision of moving
20 toward zero, we will not find the essential cooperation
21 required to stop our downward spiral.

22 In some respects, the goal of a world free
23 of nuclear weapons is like the top of a very tall
24 mountain. From the vantage point of our troubled world
25 today, we can't even see the top of the mountain and it

1 is tempting and easy to say we can't get there from
2 here. But the risks from continuing to go down the
3 mountain or standing pat are too real to ignore. We
4 must chart a course to higher ground, where the
5 mountaintop becomes more visible.

6 And there's a list of additional people
7 that were part of developing this statement and this
8 recommendation.

9 Coming out of the first statement in
10 January of 2007, a number of us came up with the idea of
11 creating a new Campaign for a Nuclear Weapons Free
12 World. That campaign is now up and operating and we
13 have several recommendations about the complex
14 transformation.

15 The complex transformation reflects
16 outdated thinking. Momentum is building behind a broad
17 bipartisan consensus that it is in the security interest
18 of the United States to pursue a nuclear weapons free
19 world.

20 A 2007 world opinion pole indicated that
21 73 percent of Americans support this goal. The U.S.
22 must get back on the path toward a nuclear weapons free
23 world by adopting a comprehensive and balanced nuclear
24 non-proliferation strategy.

25 Complex transformation puts the cart

1 before the horse. The Department of Energy is
2 proceeding with this proposal in the absence of a plan
3 for the future role of nuclear weapons or the future
4 size of the stockpile.

5 It is unreasonable and premature to invest
6 in a major overhaul of the nuclear weapons complex
7 without a reexamination of the role of nuclear weapons
8 in U.S. security strategy. The next president should
9 and by law will undertake that review.

10 Nuclear weapons serve no useful purpose in
11 dealing with current international security dangers
12 faced by the United States. Nevertheless, U.S. military
13 strategy calls for maintaining more than 2000 deployed
14 strategic nuclear bombs two decades after the end of the
15 Cold War, with thousands more in reserve.

16 The U.S. should work to achieve
17 dramatically deeper reductions in U.S. and Russian
18 nuclear and missile stockpiles and engage other
19 countries in negotiations to reach zero nuclear weapons.

20 The DOE's complex transformation proposal
21 is inconsistent with the U.S. national and international
22 security goals, which depend upon improving the global
23 system to stop nuclear weapons proliferation and moving
24 towards nuclear disarmament.

25 Through the 1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation

1 Treaty, the United States has committed to implement
2 deeper, verifiable and irreversible nuclear weapons
3 reduction and to support the Comprehensive Nuclear Test
4 Ban Treaty.

5 Failure to fulfill these obligations and
6 amass new warhead production erodes confidence that the
7 nuclear weapons states intend to fulfill their NPT
8 commitments and complicates efforts to repair the
9 beleaguered non-proliferation system.

10 There are practical steps leading to a
11 world without nuclear weapons. The United States can
12 lead the world in reducing the nuclear threat and earn
13 the world's respect and good will as a result.

14 The U.S. can lead by example, renounce the
15 development of new nuclear weapons and ratify the
16 Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

17 So it's not just, you know, radical
18 left-wingers that are advocating this, these are former
19 secretaries of state, secretaries of defense, world
20 leaders are calling for us to create the vision of a
21 world without nuclear weapons.

22 And I think that it's not just an abstract
23 Congress and the President, it is the people of the
24 United States working together with you all that we can
25 create this and we have to move in that direction.

1 Thank you.

2 MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Our
3 third speaker is Scott Kovac.

4 MR. KOVAC: Thank you. My name is Scott
5 Kovac. I'm with Nuclear Watch New Mexico. I do want to
6 thank Mr. Wyka and NNSA for this opportunity, and I want
7 to also thank them for being so helpful on getting the
8 reference documents online.

9 During the scoping comments for what was
10 then called Complex 2030, more than 33,000 comment
11 documents were received, and a majority of them stated
12 that the United States is violating the Nuclear
13 Non-Proliferation Treaty.

14 Most stated that the National Nuclear
15 Security Administration should assess an additional
16 alternative, disarmament in compliance with the NPT, and
17 not design new weapons.

18 The draft SPEIS should include a fifth
19 alternative, a no production alternative. Under the no
20 production alternative the NNSA would continue to
21 operate only those facilities required to achieve safe,
22 secure, efficient disassembly and dismantlement of
23 nuclear weapons and the disposition and disposal of
24 their constituent parts. Weapons assembly operations
25 would cease and the resources would transition to

1 disassembly.

2 The no production alternative would lead
3 the way to addressing the horrendous environmental
4 legacy of nuclear weapons production.

5 By closing the complex, our tax dollars
6 could be redirected to clean up and remediate the
7 impacts to the health and the environment of the
8 communities down wind and downstream of the nuclear
9 weapons complex sites.

10 I'd like to just go through some of the
11 slides. I had a couple of comments on the presentation
12 tonight.

13 It was mentioned that the need for nuclear
14 weapons will not change in the foreseeable future.
15 The -- the President -- the next administration will be
16 required to reassess the nuclear weapons posture in a
17 document called the nuclear posture review, and that's
18 due in 19 -- I mean in 2009.

19 I would like to say -- let's see. One of
20 the -- which gets us to this picture of the complex
21 transformation proposal, which starts with the 2001
22 nuclear posture review.

23 There is -- and amongst all this, we get
24 another nuclear posture review in 2009. So, you know,
25 what's going on here? I think -- I think the mission

1 might change, the proposed need might change very soon.

2 Another -- another slide -- slide six
3 mentioned a responsive infrastructure is needed to meet
4 stockpile stewardship requirements.

5 The stockpile stewardship program is
6 working fine, it works good. Our nuclear weapons
7 stockpile is certified safe and reliable every year.

8 This -- slide six also states that we need
9 to meet national security requirements in a timely,
10 cost-effective and agile manner in the future.

11 You know, I'm trying to -- trying to
12 figure out what -- what could come up that we can't
13 already meet. What national security requirements is
14 there -- could there possibly be that our current
15 stockpile, you know, of 22 -- or our future stockpile,
16 even, of 2200 warheads could not assess -- or address,
17 you know, heaven forbid. Pardon me.

18 When I drove out here this morning, out
19 here on West I-40 there's a new windmill farm. I hadn't
20 been down there in a while and it looked like they were
21 still putting -- at least putting a new one up or two.
22 I don't know how long it's been there. Imagine if the
23 focus and the energies and the talents of our weapons
24 engineers were focused towards stuff like windmills and
25 renewable energy.

1 Pantex assembles and disassembles nuclear
2 warheads, but something happens, they have a life
3 extension program, it's called, where they -- where they
4 assemble and disassemble these warheads. The life
5 extension program does more than just replace the worn
6 out parts or the aging parts.

7 The W76 warhead is getting its -- it's a
8 little bit more than just replacing old parts. It
9 increases its accuracy, it increases its timing fuse.

10 You know, it almost -- it's almost -- it's
11 just very close to almost being a new weapon. Maybe it
12 has the same pit, plutonium pit, the trigger, but that's
13 probably about it.

14 You know, most of the other weapons, as
15 far as we can tell -- and they don't tell me -- they
16 don't give me a lot of information. Most of the -- most
17 of the weapons -- most of the parts are new parts.

18 You know, the W76 is a new weapon. We
19 need to dismantle our warheads, not upgrade them. We
20 don't need new ones.

21 So the -- this complex transformation has
22 a lot to do with plutonium pit production and the need
23 for plutonium pit production.

24 I have another alternative that I would
25 like to see on this. I would like to see just analyzing

1 the weapons production -- weapons complex that only
2 needs 20 pits. That's our current capacity, 20
3 plutonium pits per year at Los Alamos. Last year, in
4 2007, they made 10 plutonium pits.

5 Each year, the best we can figure, NNSA
6 destructively analyzes one pit per weapon -- you know,
7 per warhead type. Given seven or eight warhead types,
8 you know, NNSA currently would only need seven or eight
9 pits per year; Los Alamos made 10 last year, they have a
10 20 pit capacity.

11 What -- you know, what does all this extra
12 capacity -- what is 50 pits for? What is 120 pits for?
13 What is all this for?

14 You know, also, it's recently been
15 released, last year, I believe, that the pits last a
16 hundred years. Currently our oldest pit in our
17 stockpile is 30 years old. We have 70 years of existing
18 pits. We are decreasing the number of weapons in our
19 stockpile. You know, we have plenty of capacity.

20 You know, as far as -- you know, as far as
21 analyzing the impacts of something, you know, why not
22 analyze the impacts of setting one of these off? Why
23 not analyze the impacts of starting, you know, a nuclear
24 holocaust. Thank you.

25 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. I don't

1 have anyone else right now on the list. Is there
2 anybody who would like to speak at this time?

3 If you would be so kind as to give us your
4 name again.

5 MR. FINEGOLD: My name is Allen Finegold.
6 I made some remarks earlier today. If anyone is
7 interested, they can check on them.

8 I think some of what we have in dispute
9 depends upon factual information that's not been made
10 available, especially concerning the length of time that
11 pits or weapons retain the capability to do what they
12 were designed to do.

13 I realize that some of the information is
14 classified and certainly the DOE is not going to be
15 incautious about releasing what information would enable
16 us to do some determination of the life of these
17 weapons; however, I do trust them enough to understand
18 why they might want to retain a reserve capacity for pit
19 production in excess of what presently exists.

20 What we do not know is the situation that
21 exists in Russia, which necessarily will affect any
22 decisions that are made about disarmament.

23 It is unfortunate that in the past five or
24 six years both the United States government and the
25 Russian government have been rather secretive concerning

1 the activities that have taken place in order to achieve
2 disarmament. I hope that they will be less so in the
3 near future.

4 I had suggested earlier today that there
5 be a conference in Amarillo, similar to the one that was
6 held in 1995, among citizens and scientists from Russia
7 and from the United States to discuss the considerations
8 involved in a nuclear disarmament program.

9 Since that time great progress has been
10 made and I am not averse to having a hundred or 200 pits
11 per year renovated, if that also results in, say,
12 a thousand to 2,000 weapons per year being retired.

13 Again, this is a matter which the
14 Department of Defense needs to address, and since they
15 don't seem to be willing to do it we end up talking to
16 you folks instead. I hope that they will change that
17 policy in the near future.

18 There was a time when they were a little
19 more forthcoming. I recall sending a letter to the
20 Department of Defense more than 43 years ago, about two
21 years after the Cuban Missile Crisis, asking seven
22 rather specific questions about nuclear weapons policy,
23 and I got back a letter.

24 It didn't say, call us again when the Cold
25 War is over, it actually provided answers, seven

1 specific answers, paragraph by paragraph, to what I had
2 asked, and it was signed by a deputy undersecretary of
3 the Navy.

4 If that could be managed in late 1964, I
5 think certainly the Department of Defense could be
6 somewhat forthcoming about the remaining stockpiles of
7 weapons now.

8 Again, however, the matter doesn't depend
9 on the United States alone, it also depends on Russia,
10 and without further information of their attitudes and
11 whether or not they trust the general process, it's
12 going to be very difficult for the public to assess what
13 the strategy should be for further disarmament. I think
14 it is probably even difficult at this point for the
15 United States government to assess it.

16 I do think it would be helpful that after
17 the statement is made by the United States government
18 concerning nuclear posture in 2009, and after a possible
19 conference in Amarillo, that there be a second
20 conference in Austin, Texas in the year 2010.

21 There's a great deal of expertise there
22 and it seems to me a good site for a general conference
23 which would include representatives from the United
24 States, Russia, France, Britain, perhaps even Pakistan
25 and India.

1 I hope that the DOE would urge the
2 Department of Defense to try to hold a series of public
3 hearings on nuclear defense policy and disarmament
4 during the year 2009.

5 I can understand the caution that the
6 Department of Defense and obviously the President has
7 about rushing the disarmament process, but there are now
8 too many incentives for foreign nations to acquire these
9 weapons and the pressure that we have on us concerning
10 that does have a bearing on how swiftly we can or should
11 disarm, and, of course, the Russians are in the same
12 position.

13 There are two developments that do
14 somewhat disturb me. They concern not renovation of
15 present weapons, but the possibility of creating new
16 types of weapons. One of them is miniaturization.

17 This may be a technically very interesting
18 matter, but it has potentially disastrous implications
19 for world safety, and however desirable it may seem to
20 be to create weapons of a extraordinary nature in terms
21 of being able to pack more punch in a small volume, the
22 disadvantages in terms of security are so overwhelming I
23 think we should avoid going down that path.

24 The second possibility is what we call
25 development of blunderbusters. There might be good

1 reasons one would wish to have such weapons; however,
2 the existence of them, rather than just the plans for
3 them, the actual existence of them raises some very
4 serious questions about the most important of the
5 United States policies during the Cold War, and that is
6 no first use of nuclear weapons no matter how tempting
7 it may be.

8 I think both of these matters need to be
9 discussed by the Department of Defense with experts and
10 with the general public. Again, I think the year 2010
11 would be very good for that purpose. Thank you.

12 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Finegold. Is
13 there anyone else who would like to speak at this time?

14 Okay. What we're going to do, as we did
15 this afternoon, I'm going to call a recess in a minute,
16 and we will be here for another hour and 45 minutes, an
17 hour and 15 or so, we'll be here until 10:00.

18 You're certainly welcome to stay and chat,
19 and if you decide that you would like to add or -- add
20 to the comments, we'll reopen the hearing for that
21 purpose, and certainly if anybody else walks in the door
22 and would like to speak, we will also open it. In the
23 meantime, we will go into recess.

24 For those of you who choose not to stay --
25 I'm not asking you to leave, I hope that you will stay,

1 but if you do choose to leave, I want to thank you very
2 much for coming. I know many of you came both this
3 afternoon and this evening and we recognize the amount
4 of time it takes from your schedules.

5 On behalf of the Department of Energy, I
6 also want to thank you for the very thoughtful comments
7 that have been made both this afternoon and this evening
8 and we very much appreciate that.

9 So at this point, this meeting is
10 recessed.

11 (Recess.)

12 MR. LAWSON: Okay. It is now five
13 minutes of 10:00. We have had no other people who have
14 signed up to speak and so in a minute I will adjourn
15 this meeting.

16 But before I do, I want to thank our
17 stenographer today, Brenda Rohrs, for her good work, and
18 also note all of the folks who came to our meeting,
19 especially those who made comments, some very excellent
20 comments.

21 Finally, I would remind people that
22 comments will be accepted by the Department of Energy up
23 until and including April 10.

24 This, then, concludes today's hearing for
25 the Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Impact

1 Statement for Complex Transformation Program. This
2 hearing is adjourned at 9:55.

3 (Hearing adjourned.)

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

1 THE STATE OF TEXAS.)

2

3 I, BRENDA ROHRS, CSR in and for the State of
4 Texas, do hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings
5 were reported by me and that the foregoing transcript
6 constitutes a full, true and correct transcription of my
7 stenographic notes.

8 Subscribed and sworn to on this the 31st day
9 of March, 2008.

10

11

Brenda Rohrs

12

Texas CSR No. 1760

Expiration Date: 12-31-2008

13

4103 W. 49th St.

Amarillo, Texas 79109

14

(806) 355-8181

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25