

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

12:00 P.M. TO 3:00 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

1		
2		PAGE
3	SPEAKERS:	
4	TOM EGAN -----	10
5	DORIS BERG SMITH -----	13
6	STEVE PRITCHETT -----	20
7	MINNIE VENABLE -----	22
8	RAY NORDHAUSEN -----	24
9	JERRY STEIN -----	24
10	ALLEN FINEGOLD -----	26
11	MINA FIELDS JOHNSON -----	33
12	SUSAN GORDON -----	35
13	LORITA MONTGOMERY -----	39
14	PAM ALLISON -----	41
15	JOYCE HINSLEY -----	43
16	JEAN EGAN -----	47
17	JIM SIMMS -----	55
18	TOM EGAN -----	57
19	LORITA MONTGOMERY -----	61
20		
21	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE -----	63
22		
23		
24		
25		

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

8 I hope you've had an opportunity to browse
9 the displays and talk to project staff and generally
10 enjoy a social hour, the just completed open house. If
11 not, there will be other opportunities this afternoon
12 and this evening.

13 My name is Barry Lawson, and I'm pleased
14 to serve as the moderator for this hearing. My role
15 this afternoon, and later on this evening in that
16 session, is to ensure that there are opportunities for
17 all of you who are attending the hearing to obtain
18 information about the proposed program and to provide
19 you -- provide us with your comments and to ensure that
20 everyone observes a few basic ground rules that are
21 intended to provide for a fair and respectful
22 participation by all.

23 As you signed in at the registration table
24 outside you should have received a participant's packet,
25 which contains information on the transformation of the

1 nuclear weapons complex.

2 There are two parts to this hearing. The
3 informal segment began with the open house and continues
4 after my remarks with a brief welcome video by
5 Mr. Robert Smolen, who is the Deputy Administrator for
6 Defense Programs, and a 20 minute presentation by Ted
7 Wyka, the Supplemental EIS Document Manager.

8 Mr. Wyka will discuss the complex
9 transformation project and the contents of the
10 Supplemental PEIS.

11 The formal segment will begin following
12 Mr. Wyka's presentation and during that formal segment
13 you will have an opportunity to make oral comments on
14 the supplemental PEIS.

15 I will then -- actually, the court
16 reporter, at that point, will then begin making a
17 verbatim record of your comments.

18 There will be no exchange of questions and
19 answers. The NNSA officials here will be here primarily
20 to listen to your comments, but will not be engaging in
21 dialogue.

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

1 I will be recognizing the speakers as
2 their names appear on the registration list provided to
3 me when we begin.

4 The ground rules for speakers providing
5 additional information or providing oral comments to us:
6 In the formal session members of the public will be
7 allotted up to three minutes each to make their
8 comments.

9 Now, as an aside here, we -- at this point
10 we do not have a lot of speakers and I can bend the
11 three minutes a little bit, but it's really fair if you
12 can try to be concise and keep to that three minute
13 limit.

14 If you should have a longer written
15 statement, I would urge you to summarize your comments
16 orally and submit the written document in its entirety.

17 And if you believe that you would like to
18 have more than the allotted time, you let me know and if
19 there is time remaining after everyone has had an
20 opportunity to give his or her first comments, I can
21 bring you back for additional time if you want it.

22 That's it for the agenda and the hearing
23 format. Are there any questions about how we will
24 proceed?

25 All right. Very good. I thank you in

1 advance for your cooperation in making this a productive
2 and respectful hearing and I look forward to your
3 participation.

4 Now, for the eight minute video, to be
5 followed directly by Mr. Wyka's presentation, and right
6 after that we'll begin the formal testimony session.

7 (Video presentation by Mr. Robert Smolen,
8 (followed by oral presentation by Mr. Ted
9 (Wyka.

10 MR. LAWSON: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Wyka.
11 I appreciate that. We'll move right into the formal
12 segment. And if you will bear with me, I will read for
13 the record for verbatim transcription my introductory
14 remarks for the public comment hearing.

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

19 This hearing is being held on February
20 28th, 2008, in the Amarillo Globe-News Center. It is
21 being held to receive comments on the content of the
22 Supplemental PEIS.

23 We are commencing the public comment
24 portion of this hearing at approximately 12:40 p.m. and
25 are scheduled to adjourn when all participants have had

1 a chance to make their comments, or 3:00 at the latest.

2 Each speaker will have a maximum of three
3 minutes, and if there are elected Federal and State
4 officials, we would begin with them.

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

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

14 The court reporter today is Brenda Rohrs,
15 she's over here to my far left, and her task is to
16 create a complete and accurate transcription of this
17 hearing.

18 NNSA will place copies of the transcript
19 from this and other public hearings in the Freedom of
20 Information Act designated reading rooms as soon as
21 practicable.

22 If you wish to make comments today, you
23 must first have signed up at the registration table and
24 I will recognize speakers in the order in which they are
25 registered, allowing elected officials to go first if

1 there are any.

2 I would ask you to please remain in this
3 room if you are scheduled to speak. I will be calling
4 three speakers at a time, the current and the following
5 two, so that you'll have some warning before you are to
6 speak.

7 When I call upon you, if you would please
8 move to the podium to the left of where Mr. Wyka is
9 seated, I would appreciate that.

10 If you are approaching the time limit,
11 which I said was three minutes, but I'm going to be
12 somewhat flexible on that, I will ask you to summarize
13 your remaining comments as quickly, yet as gracefully as
14 possible.

15 I don't think we will need a recess,
16 except if we run out of speakers, we'll take a break,
17 but we will stay here until 3:00 and reopen the hearing
18 if there are other speakers.

19 I would ask you to please conduct any
20 conversations you'd like to have outside of this room
21 and would ask you also to take a moment to turn off cell
22 phones, in you have one.

23 Commenters are recommended to state their
24 name for the court reporter's record, and if you have a
25 written copy of your comments or if you have a written

1 document that you would like to submit as an exhibit,
2 please bring it to me after you have spoken.

3 All written materials will be formally
4 accepted into the record of this hearing, in addition to
5 the oral comments, and each is weighed equally by NNSA.

6 Remember you may also submit comments by
7 April 10, 2008, and there is no limitation on the number
8 or length of comments an individual may submit.

9 Okay. With the preliminaries out of the
10 way, I'm ready to introduce our first speakers. Our
11 first speaker will be Jean Egan and followed by Tom Egan
12 and then Doris Berg Smith.

13 MS. EGAN: Sir?

14 MR. LAWSON: Yes.

15 MS. EGAN: I would like to defer -- I
16 misunderstood the time frame and I wrote a little story
17 and so -- it's a little bit lengthy, and I would like to
18 defer to the end, if there is extra time, that I might
19 do it then, and if not, I'll submit it in writing.

20 MR. LAWSON: All right. You may do so.

21 MS. EGAN: Thank you.

22 MR. LAWSON: Okay. Tom Egan, after Tom
23 Egan, Doris Berg Smith, and then Steve Pritchett.

24 MR. EGAN: Welcome you all, Mr. Wyka,
25 Mr. Allen. This is stop three on the complex

1 transformation tour. My name is Tom Egan and I am from
2 the deep south, also known as Austin, Texas. I'm 73,
3 and in the jargon of missile speak, I'm retired. I'm
4 reliable, but I'm in no way replaceable.

5 I would like to have submitted my remarks
6 in terms of social context rather than directly about my
7 sentiments about the proposal for complex
8 transformation, but I'll set them aside for the moment.
9 Perhaps maybe later in the presentation I'll be able to
10 return.

11 And so I would just like to state my
12 simple personal position on this issue. The nonviolent
13 teachings of Jesus, as articulated through the writers
14 of the New Testament and also as practiced by Jesus, are
15 what beckon me to this podium, I would rather be
16 elsewhere.

17 And I am mindful of Jesus' words,
18 especially this season of the liturgical year, to put
19 aside the sword, enough of swords.

20 Nuclear weapons, in my mind, to invent
21 them or create them, design them and then to make them
22 and then to plan and strategize to use them, even on
23 behalf of national security, is, in my ethic,
24 intrinsically wrong.

25 These weapons are immoral, in my mind, and

1 so I would view complex transformation as an immoral
2 proposal on its face.

3 And while being faithful to the life and
4 teaching of Jesus is the challenge that confronts me
5 personally, I have to be attentive to the signs of the
6 times, and the signs of the times concern me greatly.

7 Not long ago, in 2006, the annual Academic
8 Forum was held at Notre Dame University, and the topic
9 for that session had been the global health crisis,
10 forging solutions, effecting change.

11 And at the forum's conclusion, university
12 president, Father John Jenkins of the Holy Cross
13 Congregation, announced the creation of the Notre Dame
14 Millennium Development Initiative.

15 And in these remarks he said that as a
16 Notre Dame family, we can and must make a difference in
17 the world.

18 That is the legacy of engagement which
19 Jesus has left to each of us, using a phrase from Pope
20 John Paul II, whose resistance to the culture of death
21 is well known.

22 I also resonate with the radical
23 understanding of Michael Baxter, who is an assistant
24 professor of theology at Notre Dame, who questions any
25 harmony that may exist or may be attempted to be forged

1 between the vision of Jesus and the political
2 arrangement of the United States where collaboration
3 with the government risks co-optation by it.

4 We need develop as possible aspects of
5 responsible citizenship, of which this hearing is part
6 and an example, and responsible discipleship, which my
7 understanding of the gospel, I hope, is one, what I call
8 a hermeneutic of suspicion.

9 We, all of us, or each of us, must
10 continually assess how we may be complicit in any
11 injustice we may wish to expose.

12 MR. LAWSON: Thirty seconds, please.

13 MR. EGAN: I thought that one of the best
14 things that could happen here, in conclusion of my
15 remarks here, is that the New York Philharmonic play
16 before the National Nuclear Security Administration, and
17 perhaps the music they selected might be Gustav Holst's
18 The Planets, perhaps Copland's Appalachian Spring, with
19 its theme, tis a gift to be simple, or if this complex
20 actually materializes, maybe Mozart's Requiem.

21 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Egan.

22 Our next speaker will be Doris Berg Smith
23 and then Steve Pritchett and Minnie Venable.

24 MS. SMITH: I would ask for five minutes.
25 I'm Doris Berg Smith and I'm speaking for myself and my

1 husband as neighbors of Pantex, and for the organization
2 of the Panhandle Area Neighbors and Landowners, which
3 has been organized since the early Nineties in the area
4 surrounding Pantex.

5 In 1991, the Department of Energy issued
6 Complex 21. We came forward and addressed the major
7 issues. We called for the DOE to revisit their
8 modernization plan. We said there was no need to build
9 new modern facilities and to continue to build nuclear
10 bombs.

11 We addressed the issues as they related to
12 Pantex and asked that this not be built at Pantex and
13 not in anyone else's backyard. This was a waste of
14 taxpayer dollars, a waste of natural resources and a
15 major waste for the United States. We said no to
16 Complex 21.

17 In 2006, you came to us with Complex 2030.
18 We again restated our major concerns about our
19 environment, natural resources, health and safety and
20 our belief that this was a tremendous waste of taxpayer
21 dollars and too big of a misguided plan to be initiated
22 in our country. We again said no to Complex 2030.

23 Now, in 2007 and 2008, you come forth with
24 the same old girl, but in different clothes. This time
25 you call it complex transformation.

1 We are here to say, what part of no do you
2 not understand. Instead of building more and new bombs
3 and modernizing the nuclear weapons complex, NNSA/DOE
4 should be pursuing a path toward disarmament and
5 complete dismantlement of nuclear weapons.

6 Nuclear weapons are a thing of the past, a
7 Cold War mentality, and we as taxpayers will be paying
8 the bill for those years of building up the nuclear
9 establishment until we die.

10 Those future generations following us are
11 going to be paying for all the problems associated with
12 the building of the nuclear age from now until eternity.

13 The United States should take the lead
14 role to act in accordance with our disarmament
15 obligations in the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

16 It is up to us, the people, to see that
17 these obligations are met, yet how can we comply with
18 the treaty when you put forth a document like complex
19 transformation, which is nothing more than building a
20 new bombplex.

21 How are we as a nation going to stop the
22 proliferation of nuclear materials, stop the nuclear
23 pollution spreading throughout the country, advance the
24 cleanup and environmental management of the billions of
25 dollars and the billions of tons of radioactive waste

1 that are resulting from the weapons program if we
2 continue to modernize, build, store, ship and transport
3 nuclear weapons and build new facilities.

4 We come to you today to again say no.
5 Your focus is too narrow, your vision too short, your
6 insight so tainted that you do not even consider
7 anything beyond a jobs program.

8 What you should be considering and
9 addressing is a weapons complex that produces no bombs,
10 a no production alternative.

11 Stop this insanity. Show the world that
12 we are serious about disarmament and that we will
13 continue to go forward with dismantlement until we have
14 abolished these mass weapons of destruction. We are
15 killing our children, ourselves and are planet with the
16 continuation of this madness.

17 Environmental cleanup is a massive program
18 and one that needs to be better managed and better
19 funded.

20 The damage done to the groundwater,
21 rivers, lakes, soils, vegetation and air cannot be
22 rectified.

23 The health issues caused by weapons
24 production, the workers, the neighboring communities
25 which have been affected, should be more fully

1 addressed.

2 Workers and those living in communities
3 around nuclear facilities who are suffering from
4 illnesses associated with nuclear weapons work should be
5 compensated.

6 Communities having to live with these
7 facilities in their neighborhoods should be compensated
8 rather than a cover-up being done or a denial of any
9 wrongdoing by the DOE/NNSA.

10 No, we do not believe that Pantex should
11 be selected for a consolidated plutonium center,
12 consolidated uranium center, consolidated nuclear
13 production center, consolidated nuclear center housing
14 special nuclear materials. We oppose them for the
15 Panhandle of Texas and we oppose them for the good of
16 our country.

17 In the Texas Panhandle we have an
18 irreplaceable, finite source of water. The processes at
19 Pantex have already contaminated our Ogallala aquifer.
20 Remedies are being initiated; however, we are not so
21 naive as to think that this massive body of underground
22 water can ever be restored to its natural condition.

23 Rather than NNSA spending billions of
24 dollars to transform Pantex into their center of
25 excellence, they should be applying those dollars to

1 cleaning up the legacy at Pantex.

2 And Pantex is not alone in this legacy.

3 Use our taxpayer dollars for cleaning up the
4 contamination problems at all of the DOE/NNSA weapons
5 facilities.

6 Use our taxpayer dollars to manage and
7 store the millions of tons of radioactive and toxic
8 waste generated at these facilities and stop generating
9 this lethal waste, which is fatal, poisonous and noxious
10 for thousands of years.

11 DOE/NNSA has a serious problem with waste.
12 There is no suitable shipping container yet for
13 transporting this waste, there is no suitable storage
14 site yet for this waste, and there is no reason to
15 continue producing this waste.

16 This problem is only escalating and will
17 continue to increase if this proposal, complex
18 transformation, is put into effect.

19 As long as you continue to research,
20 develop, test and produce new and modified bombs, you
21 will generate this toxic waste with no place to go with
22 it.

23 If Congress, so foolhardy, appropriates
24 the hundreds of millions of dollars necessary for this
25 folly, one would only hope that DOE/NNSA would have the

1 courage to stop the process and say, we made an error of
2 judgment. We understand what the people are saying and
3 we will not continue with this plan to transform this
4 complex.

5 The issues of security, safety,
6 environmental responsibility and integrity do matter to
7 us.

8 We, the neighbors around Pantex, have
9 lived with the storage of plutonium pits, the
10 assembly/disassembly of nuclear weapons, the fabrication
11 and testing of high explosives, repairing, modification
12 and testing of nuclear weapons, the storage of special
13 nuclear materials, open burning and flashing of
14 explosives and explosive-contaminated materials for 60
15 years.

16 MR. LAWSON: Excuse me. You have 30
17 seconds, please.

18 MS. SMITH: Isn't that enough to ask from
19 one community? Must we be inundated with more? What's
20 the limit? Where's the need? How much more must we
21 endure?

22 Stop the spreading of nuclear weapons,
23 stop building new bombs and stop throwing our dollars
24 into the wind. Start cleaning up in earnest, not just
25 moving the waste around. You owe this to us. Thank

1 you, Mr. Wyka.

2 MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

3 Okay. Our next speaker is Steve
4 Pritchett. Mr. Pritchett will be followed by Minnie
5 Venable and Ray Nordhausen.

6 MR. PRITCHETT: My name is Steve
7 Pritchett. I'm Vice President of Amarillo Economic
8 Development Corporation.

9 On behalf of the Amarillo Economic
10 Development Corporation, the AEDC, thank you for the
11 opportunity to comment on the Department of Energy's
12 Complex Transformation Supplemental Programmatic
13 Environmental Impact Statement.

14 The Pantex Plant is an extraordinarily
15 important economic engine in the Amarillo community.
16 AEDC stands ready to assist the DOE and NNSA in any
17 endeavor that will retain and increase the number of
18 missions, facilities and jobs at Pantex.

19 AEDC specifically supports Pantex
20 continuing its current functions and receiving the new
21 functions and facilities listed in the preferred
22 alternatives for the SPEIS.

23 Also, AEDC stands ready to help the DOE in
24 the event Pantex is awarded any other new functions
25 discussed in the SPEIS. Obviously we would ask DOE to

1 reject any option that would result in the cessation of
2 functions at Pantex.

3 AEDC would support the addition of a
4 consolidated plutonium center, consolidated uranium
5 center, consolidated nuclear production center and/or
6 the consolidated nuclear center under the distributed
7 centers of excellence or consolidated centers of
8 excellence options.

9 Amarillo is well suited for any and all of
10 these missions. Our highly competent workforce, low
11 utility costs, positive business climate should make
12 Amarillo the most attractive and cost-effective
13 alternative DOE will consider.

14 The selection of Pantex would also avoid
15 significant transportation costs and risks. Moreover,
16 DOE must have strong, broad-based community support to
17 accomplish anything relating to new missions dealing
18 with SNM. DOE has the necessary support from the
19 Amarillo business community to help DOE's initiative
20 succeed.

21 Thank you for the opportunity to comment
22 on this initiative so important to the Amarillo
23 community.

24 This is signed by Paul Borchardt, Chairman
25 of the Board of Directors, and Richard David, President

1 and CEO, AEDC.

2 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Pritchett.

3 Our next speaker is Minnie Venable, to be
4 followed by Ray Nordhausen and Jerry Stein.

5 MS. VENABLE: My name is Minnie Venable.
6 I am a member of the Amarillo Unitarian Universalist
7 Fellowship.

8 Unitarian Universalists have a long
9 history of opposition to nuclear arms. We have adopted
10 official statements of conscience opposing them in some
11 aspect almost every year for almost 50 years.

12 It is my understanding that the nuclear
13 weapons in existence today are an average of 10 to 30
14 times more powerful than those used at Hiroshima and
15 Nagasaki.

16 We believe that the development of new
17 weapons, ostensibly for purely defensive purposes,
18 destabilizes the precarious balance of threat and
19 deterrence, escalates further technological competition
20 and increases the likelihood of their actual use some
21 day, intentionally or accidentally.

22 I still shudder when I remember the
23 incident several months ago when several nuclear
24 warheads were apparently accidentally flown over several
25 states in our own country, in the air for several hours.

1 The United States is obligated by an
2 international treaty to pursue disarmament. I quote
3 from a statement from our Unitarian Universalist
4 Association of Congregations, jointly with a number of
5 other religious groups and organizations: The
6 construction of the consolidated plutonium center, or
7 CPC, would tell the world that the United States does
8 not intend to keep its pledge of nuclear disarmament.

9 We ask for a no action alternative for
10 Complex 2030, with the goal of not expanding the nuclear
11 pit fabrication capacity of the United States.

12 We believe that the Energy Department's
13 National Nuclear Security Administration should
14 eliminate the proposed CPC from Complex 2030 and focus
15 on meeting our Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
16 agreements and commitments.

17 We should promote non-proliferation
18 vigorously and we should clean up the existing nuclear
19 weapons complex.

20 Smaller and more secure sound appealing,
21 but it is profoundly sad to me that we have to talk
22 about spending \$150 billion, because of the nature --
23 the dangerous nature of the materials and the arms, to
24 protect us from these things, as well as any possible
25 protection someday from an enemy.

1 MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much.

2 The next speaker, Ray Nordhausen, then
3 Jerry Stein and Allen Finegold.

4 MR. NORDHAUSEN: I'm a member of the
5 American -- Amarillo Unitarian Universalist Fellowship.
6 I'm opposed to an expansion of nuclear weapons by the
7 United States and I wish to submit this statement from
8 our Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations
9 and a host of other religious organizations in
10 opposition to this proposal.

11 MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

12 Our next speaker will be Jerry Stein, and
13 Mr. Stein will be followed by Allen Finegold and Mina
14 Fields Johnson.

15 MR. STEIN: I have a statement that I
16 want to read from Leroy Matthiesen, retired Bishop of
17 the Roman Catholic Diocese of Amarillo. It's about the
18 foundation of the complex.

19 He says: I ask you to put me on the
20 record of the February 28th hearing in Amarillo as
21 adamantly opposed to the proposal to modernize our
22 nuclear weapons arsenal.

23 The possession of and the threat and
24 intent to use nuclear weapons to destroy the society of
25 any aggressor nation is immoral, so declared by the

1 Roman Catholic Church, a declaration with which I
2 personally fully agree and support.

3 Our nuclear weapons policy, first
4 enunciated in 1968 and endorsed by our government to
5 this day, spells out that by society we mean men, women
6 and children, so that the aggressor nation will no
7 longer exist as a viable society. That is immoral.

8 The attempt to produce nuclear warheads is
9 so small and so -- so small and so accurate as not to
10 destroy innocent people is fruitless, so horribly
11 expensive as to be mind-boggling, and so exhaustive of
12 our treasury that if you continue the effort you will
13 kill our brothers and sisters in Christ who increasingly
14 cannot afford medical care.

15 If you go forward with this immoral effort
16 to upgrade your nuclear sabers and rattle them in the
17 faces of the nations with whom we share planet earth,
18 you will be guilty of igniting another nuclear arms race
19 and our world will again be living in fear. Please do
20 not do this.

21 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Allen
22 Finegold.

23 MR. FINEGOLD: I would ask indulgence to
24 be the last speaker, as my remarks might be as long as
25 six minutes, and if I'm the last speaker I don't think

1 that would cause any problems.

2 MR. LAWSON: If you want six minutes now,
3 you can have six minutes now.

4 MR. FINEGOLD: Okay.

5 MR. LAWSON: While you're preparing those
6 comments, after Mr. Finegold is Mina Fields Johnson and
7 Susan Gordon.

8 MR. FINEGOLD: Okay. Your alternative
9 designated as distributed centers of excellence seems
10 the best to me. I disapprove of the alternative
11 designated consolidated centers of excellence.

12 If the Department of Defense held public
13 hearings concerning U.S. nuclear weapons policy there
14 would be far less inclination on my part, and probably
15 on the part of other persons here, to use DOE hearings
16 as an opportunity to express opinions regarding those
17 policies.

18 Since the Department of Defense does not
19 hold such hearings, DOE's hearings are the only
20 opportunity we have to speak of such matters. That is
21 why I am not confining my remarks to the environmental
22 impact statement.

23 To some degree, those of us who live in
24 Amarillo and take an interest in U.S. policy regarding
25 nuclear weapons are acting as representatives and

1 surrogates for United States citizens at large who do
2 not get the opportunity to come to DOE hearings, much
3 less Department of Defense conferences.

4 We also tend to have a greater familiarity
5 with these issues than the general public. Because of
6 the proximity of the Pantex Plant there is a heightened
7 interest in the issue of nuclear weapons, greater access
8 to Department of Energy publications and, to some
9 degree, a better sense of how a general national policy
10 affects the lives of individuals, particularly with
11 respect to their health.

12 Having the Pantex Plant within 25 miles is
13 somewhat like having a tame rhinoceros in your living
14 room. Since 1991, it has been a well-behaved
15 rhinoceros, which is extraordinary, but it still is a
16 rhinoceros.

17 We realize that there are many technical
18 matters which the DOE is reluctant to divulge and many
19 which DOE considers to be secret and some that should be
20 secret.

21 Still, we do have a general idea of the
22 considerations of -- involved in maintaining stockpile,
23 and DOE has made a very considerable amount of
24 information available to the public.

25 I believe most, if not everyone here,

1 appreciates that DOE has made important information
2 available.

3 I also appreciate, as I believe everyone
4 here does, the great effort that DOE employees have made
5 in the dismantling of nuclear weapons and guarding of
6 the pits taken out of them.

7 Those of us who are DOE critics are not
8 unmindful of the progress DOE has made. It is an
9 enormously important accomplishment that tens of
10 thousands of these weapons have been taken apart, yet
11 tens of thousands remain, and the dismantlement program
12 must continue if future generations are to live free of
13 the nuclear threat.

14 I hope I live to see the day when there
15 are fewer than 500 of these weapons possessed by either
16 Russia or the United States, and that there are fewer
17 than 500 held in total by all other nations. I hope
18 that then further negotiations would take place to
19 abolish these weapons. Meanwhile, there remains a lot
20 of work to be done by DOE employees and by others.

21 I guess that there are times when the
22 process, for technical or political reasons, slows down.
23 I wish there was a rapid, straight line decline in the
24 number of weapons, but if it is the case that the
25 dismantlement does not always proceed as rapidly as was

1 originally hoped, that does not mean we should value
2 less the progress that is made, nor devalue diplomatic
3 attempts to regain initiative toward a faster pace of
4 dismantlement.

5 There are probably times when it is
6 important to put some extra effort into activities that
7 build trust between the Russian and American people and
8 their governments. I think the next year or two would
9 be a good time interval for such activity.

10 In furtherance of that goal, I hope DOE
11 and the Department of Defense would consider sponsoring
12 a public conference for interested citizens from both
13 countries to get together with scientists from both to
14 discuss issues relevant to nuclear disarmament, the use
15 of nuclear power, and the control and/or disposal of
16 nuclear material.

17 Such a conference was once held in
18 Amarillo, I believe in the late spring of 1995. It
19 seems to me that Amarillo would be an excellent place in
20 which to hold its second such conference in the spring
21 of 2009, 14 years later. It would also be close to the
22 halfway point of the disarmament process.

23 Participants should certainly include
24 Russians and Americans, but I believe it would also be
25 helpful to have observers from other countries,

1 including India and Pakistan. French nuclear scientists
2 could be especially helpful for the expertise they
3 represent for the use or disposal of plutonium.

4 I think it is very important for the
5 United States and Russian governments to make final
6 plans for disposal of the plutonium that form the pits
7 of the weapons that have been dismantled and form the
8 pits of the ones that will be dismantled.

9 Since French nuclear reactors are already
10 set up to make use of MOX fuel, it might be appropriate
11 to discuss the prospects, including security and safety
12 requirements, for shipping some, if not most of the
13 Russian plutonium to France for use in their reactors.

14 This would enable the Russian government
15 to dispose of plutonium without having to build its own
16 MOX reactors or plutonium waste disposal plant. One
17 moment, please.

18 There are a few other matters which are so
19 closely tied to United States defense policy that some
20 response from the DOD is required for any sound and fair
21 evaluation by the citizens of this country of any
22 proposal for the nuclear weapons complex.

23 One of these matters is how many weapons
24 will have to be kept up as a deterrent while the
25 dismantlement process as a whole continues.

1 I know that this has something to do with
2 the proportion of deuterium and/or lithium in the core
3 of the weapons and I don't expect DOE to disclose either
4 the quantities involved or how long it takes for the
5 cores to, as a manner of speaking, go stale.

6 There may also be some sort of spoilage
7 factor involved in the pits themselves when binders are
8 mixed with the fissile material.

9 Whatever the technical considerations, I
10 suppose that some of the weapons have to be assembled,
11 disassembled and then reassembled.

12 There does, however, arise in my mind the
13 question of perception. Does the fact that DOE
14 renovates weapons to maintain a deterrent diminish the
15 credibility of the dismantlement program.

16 I'm still confident that the United States
17 Department of Defense, Department of Energy and the
18 Office of the President is committed to an overall
19 nuclear arms reduction and that top officials want this
20 to be accomplished at least as fast as it has been in
21 the past.

22 MR. LAWSON: Excuse me, sir. How are we
23 doing for time?

24 MR. FINEGOLD: Two more minutes.

25 MR. LAWSON: Okay.

1 then Susan Gordon and Lorita Montgomery.

2 MS. JOHNSON: I've been aware of Pantex
3 all my life. When I was just a little girl, my father,
4 Madison Fields, a farmer in Carson County, was one of
5 the men who helped the government set the price the
6 government would pay the farmers for their land.

7 I wasn't sure how he knew about this, so
8 shortly before he died I asked my father if this was
9 true and what his part had been. And he -- he said to
10 me, you know, that didn't make me any friends.

11 My taking a stand today against building
12 any new nuclear weapons will not likely win friends for
13 me either, but my conscience compels me to rise before
14 you today, just as my father did what seemed patriotic
15 and right in his time. I am acting on that same
16 principle today.

17 In this beautiful place which is our home,
18 Pantex represents a dark and terrible blot. It is a
19 symbol of our failure as human beings.

20 The purpose of Pantex is to participate in
21 building nuclear bombs, which rain death and destruction
22 on women, children, homes, businesses, farms. You may
23 think this is a NIMBY response, not in my backyard, but
24 I don't want nuclear weapons anywhere in the world.

25 The United States has signed a Nuclear

1 Non-Proliferation Treaty, which enshrines the principle
2 that no state should have nuclear weapons, yet nothing
3 in the Draft Complex Transformation Supplemental
4 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement supports
5 that treaty, indeed what we are talking about here today
6 is really building more bombs.

7 America should be leading the way in
8 creating a world without nuclear weapons, not
9 strengthening our own arsenal.

10 What was once unthinkable has become
11 thinkable. We never believed that the bombs that were
12 assembled here would be used, but now we hear talk on
13 every hand about the possibility of a preemptive strike.
14 As long as weapons are available there will always be
15 that temptation.

16 Dwight D. Eisenhower pledged America's
17 determination to help solve the fearful atomic dilemma,
18 to devote its entire heart and mind to find a way by
19 which the miraculous inventiveness of man shall not be
20 dedicated to his death, but consecrated to his life.
21 The challenge is no less real today than it was when
22 President Eisenhower spoke in 1953.

23 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, ma'am.

24 The next speaker is Susan Gordon, followed
25 by Lorita Montgomery and by Pam Allison.

1 MS. GORDON: Hello. My name is Susan
2 Gordon and I'm the director of the Alliance for Nuclear
3 Accountability and I thank you for the opportunity to
4 speak and address our concerns today.

5 And I want to particularly thank you,
6 Mr. Wyka, for ensuring that the documents for the draft
7 SPEIS were posted on the Web site. This is really of
8 great benefit to those of us who actually read those
9 documents. We really appreciate that, so thank you.

10 I want to start with addressing the 1996
11 Stockpile Stewardship and Management Program, which
12 evaluated the alternatives for maintaining the safety
13 and reliability of the U.S. nuclear weapons stockpile.

14 The '96 record of decision documented the
15 decision related to fulfilling these requirements
16 without underground testing.

17 The ROD did not -- excuse me, the ROD did
18 not propose any new production facilities, therefore no
19 environmental impacts were envisioned for the huge
20 transformation that is currently proposed.

21 I question the legality and
22 appropriateness of offering complex transformation as a
23 supplemental to the original SSM PEIS and the 1996 ROD.

24 I believe that the complex transformation
25 plan should be released as a stand alone environmental

1 impact statement.

2 I also want to point out a discrepancy in
3 the '96 ROD and the draft SPEIS. The Kansas City Plant
4 had a clear and important role in the ROD, but it's
5 completely been left out of the SPEIS.

6 The proposed spending of \$500 million in
7 taxpayer dollars for a new facility, with a claim that
8 there will be no environmental impacts in that
9 community, when that facility plays such a central role
10 in the weapons complex, is a serious omission and this
11 needs to be rectified before a new ROD is issued.

12 With more than 33,000 comment documents
13 that were received, and the majority of them stating
14 that the United States is violating the Nuclear
15 Non-Proliferation Treaty, and most of them also stating
16 that the NNSA should assess an additional alternative,
17 disarmament in compliance with the NPT and not design a
18 new weapon, that alternative is strikingly absent from
19 the alternatives that are presented in the draft, and
20 because that alternative was not presented, this is a
21 deficiency that must be rectified in the final SPEIS as
22 well.

23 And we are proposing that a fifth
24 alternative be included, a no production alternative.
25 Under the no production alternative, the NNSA would

1 continue to operate only those facilities required to
2 achieve the safe, secure, efficient disassembly and
3 dismantlement of nuclear weapons and the disposition/
4 disposal of their constituent parts.

5 The need for weapons design activities
6 will shift. Some weapons design capacities will need to
7 be maintained to address possible questions that arise
8 during decommissioning, disassembly, dismantlement and
9 disposition of the stock pile.

10 Plutonium operations requirements will be
11 reduced to questions of safe extraction, processing and
12 disposal of plutonium currently in pits and warheads, in
13 storage, or in other NNSA inventories.

14 Uranium operations in support of
15 disassembly, dismantlement and disposition regimes would
16 be located at the Y-12 Plant in Oak Ridge, where
17 considerable infrastructure, including a uranium storage
18 facility, currently exists.

19 Weapons assembly operations would cease
20 and resources would transition to disassembly. The need
21 for high explosives -- excuse me, high explosives
22 production for nuclear weapons would no longer exist.
23 Bench-scale facilities might be maintained until all
24 questions about high explosives stability and the
25 behavior of high explosives during disassembly/

1 dismantlement operations would be resolved.

2 Co-location of storage facilities for some
3 or all Category I and II special nuclear materials under
4 international administrative control should be analyzed
5 in a no production alternative.

6 And tritium production will no longer be
7 necessary. Tritium production activities at the Watts
8 Bar Nuclear Plant in Tennessee will cease and tritium
9 operations at Savannah River will be scaled back and
10 tritium extraction will cease.

11 The benefits of a no production
12 alternative include that this will lead the way to
13 addressing the horrendous environmental legacy of
14 nuclear weapons production.

15 By closing the complex, our tax dollars
16 can be redirected to clean up and remediate the impact
17 to the health and environment of the communities down
18 wind and downstream from the nuclear weapons complex
19 sites.

20 The no production alternative will enhance
21 the economic status of communities in which these
22 facilities have been located.

23 Directing the efforts of the workforce
24 towards dismantlement of warheads and cleaning up the
25 weapon production sites will create jobs and improve the

1 environmental quality of the communities. When sites
2 are cleaned they become available for other economic
3 development opportunities.

4 The no production alternative is the only
5 alternative that fulfills the United States' obligations
6 for disarmament under Article 6 of the Nuclear
7 Non-Proliferation Treaty.

8 Further, it is the only alternative in
9 which the United States complies with the 1996 World
10 Court opinion that the threat or use of nuclear weapons
11 is contrary to the rules of international law.

12 The no production alternative provides the
13 United States the opportunity to show leadership, which
14 has been called for by arms control, diplomatic and
15 military leaders around the world.

16 And the no production alternative will
17 enhance security for the United States by stopping the
18 global momentum toward nuclear proliferation and
19 increase security for every country. Thank you.

20 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, ma'am.

21 The next speaker is Lorita Montgomery, to
22 be followed by Pam Allison and Joyce Hinsley.

23 MS. MONTGOMERY: Hi. I'm Lorita
24 Montgomery and I'm from Canyon, Texas. And I came with
25 a written statement, but I almost didn't come today

1 because I thought, last time I came and it was all about
2 the buildings and the -- all the restructuring to do
3 away -- you know, make it safer -- to do away with the
4 bomb.

5 Okay. Today, I get here and there's this
6 strong statement on weapons on this film we saw and how,
7 you know, they are still -- that's the main goal, is
8 making new weapons.

9 And I -- maybe the film, I misinterpreted
10 it, it wasn't meant to do that, but that's the way I
11 interpreted it. So I'll go ahead with my written
12 statement now that I've made my complaint.

13 But there is today a new mandate, a
14 mandate for change that's sweeping America. With this
15 mandate we need to consider the purpose of the
16 transformation that's taking place in this branch of the
17 Department of Energy.

18 We need to direct the department away from
19 the direction of making nuclear weapons toward a future
20 in creating a safe source of energy, as the name of the
21 department implies.

22 We have, in the nuclear facilities, a
23 wealth of minds that should be working on plans -- not
24 working on plans for weapons, but on plans for building
25 a peaceful future, with clean, safe energy.

1 This new mandate would hold the nuclear --
2 would uphold the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, it
3 would also reflect the Congresses' desire when it
4 defeated the Administration's attempt to fund new
5 weapons.

6 The complex transformation proposal should
7 not contain the making of the reliable replacement
8 warhead.

9 Thank you for allowing me to speak and
10 express my opinion, and thank you, America, for the
11 freedom to do so.

12 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, ma'am.

13 The next speaker is Pam Allison, and she
14 will be follow by Joyce Hinsley and Jean Egan.

15 MS. ALLISON: Okay. Thank you for
16 letting me have this opportunity. I was -- I was quite
17 struck by the video that began this meeting, and one of
18 the statements that I wrote down from the video said
19 that we are committed to addressing every environmental
20 issue. I think it went on longer and I don't know the
21 rest of it.

22 But yet right now Pantex has no plans to
23 clean up the perched aquifer, the perched groundwater,
24 which poses the greatest threat of further contaminating
25 the Ogallala aquifer in our region. So this seems like

1 a contradiction to me.

2 The State agency, the Texas Commission on
3 Environmental Quality, which we call TCEQ, seems to be
4 losing the battle to require and hold Pantex to cleaning
5 up the perched water.

6 The EPA seems on board with Pantex and
7 they are ramrodding this through, so essentially writing
8 off the groundwater of the Texas Panhandle forever.

9 And even so, more importantly to me, what
10 makes no sense about -- about some of the possibilities
11 that we're considering today is that nuclear weapons are
12 not a deterrent and one need only look at the world
13 today to recognize and grasp and acknowledge this fact.

14 It makes no sense to build weapons that
15 are so destructive that they can never be used. If they
16 were a deterrent, it seems like the massive amounts
17 of numbers of nuclear weapons both the U.S. and the
18 Soviet Union have previously done would have eliminated
19 any need for nuclear weapons.

20 Instead, it seems to me that it fuels the
21 arms race and deprives generations to come of any future
22 opportunities. And I hope -- I think this is a grand
23 time to rethink our vision, or lack thereof. Thank you.

24 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, ma'am.

25 Joyce Hinsley, to be followed by Jean

1 Egan.

2 MS. HINSLEY: I was unable to be here at
3 the beginning of this conference -- or these hearings,
4 and so I apologize in advance for any needless
5 repetition, but this is from the heart.

6 My name is Joyce Hinsley. I'm a
7 67-year-old retired teacher, a lifelong resident of
8 Amarillo. I taught in the modern language department at
9 Amarillo College for a total of 41 years.

10 I grew up in the early years of the
11 nuclear age, when we naively believed that it might be
12 possible to shield children from the horrors of a
13 nuclear attack by having them take shelter under their
14 desks.

15 I remember vividly the fears and anxiety
16 of my early twenties, when our country awaited the
17 outcome of the Cuban missile crisis.

18 At that time I had only a glimmer of
19 understanding of what nuclear war might entail, but I
20 did understand enough to know that life on this planet
21 would never be the same if it should occur.

22 That was in the days when only two main
23 powers controlled the stockpiles of nuclear weapons,
24 when deterrence was possible because the leaders of both
25 the Soviet Union and the United States knew that

1 whichever country attacked first would be itself
2 annihilated.

3 Since I first heard of the proposed
4 transformation of the U.S. nuclear weapons complex I
5 have wanted to learn more about it and to have an
6 opportunity to express my opinion.

7 I was glad to learn that much of our
8 nuclear stockpile would be dismantled and that the
9 overall configuration of the complex would be reduced.

10 However, I was alarmed upon learning of
11 the intention to rebuild a number of weapons to produce
12 a so-called reliable replacement warhead.

13 Though Congress did not fund this
14 particular proposal in the last session, indications are
15 that other attempts will be made to secure funding for
16 the development of the RRW.

17 This is definitely not the way to reduce
18 the danger of a nuclear attack upon the United States.
19 Indeed, such activity would be seen by other countries,
20 particularly by our enemies, as a direct violation of
21 the terms of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. It
22 would provide the rationale for them to do the same.

23 Too often in today's world the U.S. is
24 perceived not as a peace-loving country trying to
25 resolve world problems, but as a bully, pursuing its own

1 agenda, looking out for its own self-interest regardless
2 of the harm we may do to other countries in the process.

3 Our continuing to modify and redesign our
4 own nuclear stockpile will only reinforce that negative
5 perception of us.

6 In the mid 1980's, Presidents Reagan and
7 Gorbachev were in agreement that the only sure remedy
8 was the complete elimination of all nuclear weapons.
9 Unfortunately, they were unable to agree on how that
10 should be accomplished, it didn't happen.

11 Today, in 2008, some 50 countries possess
12 such weapons or have the technology to be able to
13 produce them.

14 It is insane to think that continuing to
15 develop new weapons can solve the problem, we merely
16 increase the likelihood that some rogue nation or
17 terrorist faction will succeed in obtaining or
18 manufacturing such weapons and will unleash them upon us
19 without stopping to consider possible consequences.

20 In addition to the ever increasing
21 likelihood of a terrorist attack on the U.S. involving
22 nuclear weapons, another factor that must receive
23 consideration is the harm being inflicted upon the
24 environment.

25 We all know that such damage has already

1 occurred at Rocky Flats, Los Alamos and other locations,
2 and there has been contamination of perched aquifers
3 here near Pantex.

4 It is inevitable that eventually even
5 worse, possibly irremedial, damage will occur if we
6 continue research and development of new nuclear
7 weapons.

8 What will be the consequences to our area
9 and to the entire United States should the Ogallala
10 aquifer, which underlies a great portion of the
11 breadbasket of the U.S., become contaminated?

12 Life as we know it in this area is already
13 endangered by the progressive depletion of this valuable
14 resource that cannot easily be recharged.

15 We cannot continue to take for granted
16 that it will always be available to us, we must begin to
17 take active steps to ensure its preservation and
18 conservation. Continued nuclear weapons development
19 flies in the face of this goal.

20 A world opinion pole of 2007 showed that
21 73 percent of Americans support the goal of achieving a
22 nuclear weapons free world.

23 The United States should take the lead in
24 this initiative by renouncing the development of new
25 nuclear weapons and by ratifying the Comprehensive Test

1 Ban Treaty.

2 Through diplomacy and negotiation, we must
3 attempt to convince other countries to work toward the
4 goal of a nuclear weapons free world. The ultimate
5 survival of civilization as we know it, perhaps even of
6 the world itself, depends upon it.

7 MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much.

8 Our next speaker is Jean Egan.

9 MS. EGAN: Hello. My name -- buenas
10 tardes. My name is Jean Egan and I'm from Austin,
11 Texas.

12 I wrote a story instead of a statement and
13 I hope you will bear with me. It is a little bit long,
14 and I am understanding we have time for it.

15 As I said, my name is Jean Egan. I live
16 in Austin, Texas. I am a member of Pax Christi
17 New Orleans and I represent them here today.

18 I am a social worker who happens to work
19 in a program in Austin called Complex Care, which is a
20 little bit different than complex transformation.

21 I understand complex transformation is a
22 \$150 -- \$150 billion investment to upgrade the U.S.
23 nuclear weapons complex.

24 Pax Christi sees such an investment as
25 wasteful, unnecessary and illegal, as a violation of the

1 Nonnuclear Proliferation Treaty.

2 In their literature they also refer to
3 investment in such a complex to be a theft from the
4 millions of men, women and children who daily struggle
5 in dehumanizing conditions. Today I would like to focus
6 on the \$150 billion price tag as set.

7 General Eisenhower, in the early morning
8 hours of the nuclear age, recognized this and warned us
9 against the military industrial complex and its effects
10 on social conditions.

11 I speak today both as a provider of social
12 work services and as a victim of one of the most
13 devastating social crises in our history, the aftermath
14 of Hurricane Katrina.

15 I say victim instead of survivor because I
16 suffer from a nasty case of post-traumatic stress
17 disorder, which has flared up of late, causing problems
18 in many areas of my life. My marriage and my work have
19 been my saving graces throughout it all.

20 I have been a social worker since 1971.
21 It's hard work and low paying, but it has been a good
22 career.

23 I pay my taxes, I never fail to vote, I
24 engage in the democratic process and am here as a solid
25 American citizen.

1 I will interject here that to protect
2 confidentiality in the story that I'm ready to tell,
3 that it has been completely disguised.

4 Two days ago I made a home visit to a
5 58-year-old woman I will call Patsy. Patsy had been
6 discharged from a skilled nursing facility which
7 provides short-term rehab services for those who need it
8 in order to regain functioning and to return home.

9 She told me she had been kicked out of
10 that facility before she was ready or able to care for
11 herself.

12 She told me she had nowhere to go and no
13 one to provide care for her, but, nonetheless, she was
14 discharged because her Medicare replacement policy
15 covers only ten days of sniff coverage at 100 percent,
16 on day 11 she would be responsible for \$100 a day
17 co-payments, which she could not afford living on a
18 fixed income of Social Security Disability.

19 The house I approached was in one of
20 Austin's worst neighborhoods. The yard had several junk
21 cars, and nearby stood three men who my dear grandmother
22 would only describe as unsavory.

23 But I made my way to the door and found
24 Patsy lying on her side on a single bed, with one bare
25 sheet, dressed in bed clothing.

1 The room was cluttered with more
2 nondescript junk, floor to ceiling on one side of the
3 room.

4 There was a soiled chair in which I was
5 invited to sit and did, and a wheelchair sitting cater-
6 corner to the bed. Patsy never sat up, stating that her
7 legs didn't work.

8 There was no floor covering. There were
9 holes in the flooring and on the dingy walls. Jammed up
10 against the bed, stacked on the floor, were several
11 packs of adult diapers.

12 There were prescription bottles in
13 precarious piles, and teetering on a roll of paper
14 towels were Patsy's diabetic supplies: Syringes, test
15 strips and lancets.

16 The unsavory men, it appears, were Patsy's
17 lifeline. Two were friends who lived in the shabby
18 house and had allowed Patsy to come and stay with them
19 on her discharge.

20 Patsy cried pretty much throughout the
21 time I was there, describing her shame when she had to
22 call out in the night to be picked up off the floor
23 after trying to get into her wheelchair on her own.
24 Another shame is in asking them to discard the plastic
25 bags filled with her soiled diapers.

1 Patsy eats when the fellows eat and what
2 the fellows eat: A tuna sandwich, some fried chicken.
3 She's worried about her blood sugars.

4 The home health nurses that were ordered
5 on discharge just never showed up. The fellows, one of
6 whom I recognized from the homeless shelter I visit,
7 come and go. She is frightened when she's alone.

8 What is Patsy's future? First, Adult
9 Protective Services, which I called right away, then, as
10 I know as a social worker, her options will be very few,
11 and most likely, at 58, she will end up in a nursing
12 home.

13 Would two more weeks of therapy at the
14 skilled nursing facility have brought her to the point
15 of being independent at least in her wheelchair? Could
16 additional social work time have been provided up front
17 to help her find a safer, more secure setting to
18 recover? I believe so, but on whose dollar?

19 Is Patsy's case unusual? Unfortunately,
20 no, and there are many similar and many worse cases that
21 I have witnessed.

22 We seem of late to love to use the word
23 broken when we talk about the health care system. It is
24 as if it were dropped accidentally on the floor. Hey,
25 things happen. No harm, no foul.

1 But you and I know that however complex
2 the causes of the health care crisis, in the end it's
3 about money and priorities.

4 Is Patsy's problem our problem as a
5 society? No doubt Patsy probably made some bad choices
6 in her life and/or she encountered some bad
7 circumstances that led to her current hapless position,
8 but who among us would deny that one of our brothers,
9 sisters, children, cousins, aunts or lifelong friends
10 could end up in Patsy's position?

11 If Patsy was your mother or your sister
12 would platitudes about a broken health care system
13 satisfy you? Would your response not be, well, go fix
14 it. Again, on whose dollar?

15 On August 28th, 2005, my husband and I, as
16 was our custom, threw an overnight bag, a change of
17 clothes and our cat in a carrier and left our rental
18 home in New Orleans for Northern Louisiana.

19 We had a marital pact. Category three or
20 higher hurricane in the Gulf, and New Orleans in the
21 cone -- you know, that cone thing. You might not in
22 this part of the country. It's kind of a triangle and
23 it gives a projection of where the hurricane may land.

24 So if New Orleans was inside that area, we
25 agreed that we would leave, no discussions, no

1 arguments.

2 So we left New Orleans many times and
3 returned many times a day or two later to resume our
4 lives.

5 On August 30th, when the levees broke, we
6 suddenly found ourselves homeless, with our only
7 possessions being a '94 Ford Tempo, a change of clothes
8 and an aged, sickly cat named Douglas.

9 We lost everything and our lives were
10 broken. Most days I wake up hopeful and continue to
11 work hard, as I have all my life. We work to transform
12 our complex.

13 We still scour thrift stores for
14 furniture, we still accept donations of household goods
15 from friends.

16 It is hard so late in our lives to lose
17 everything: Our community, our professional identities
18 and reputations in that community, our niche, you might
19 say, in the human ecosystem.

20 While no amount of money can replace a
21 life, there are so many lives that could be rebuilt for
22 the many still homeless and helpless American citizens
23 in New Orleans and in the diaspora.

24 So finally I will make a connection
25 between these stories and the question of complex

1 transformation.

2 I believe people across the world are
3 struggling to survive, yet one or two of these weapons,
4 if ever used, would erase forever their valiant efforts.

5 I believe that people deserve to survive
6 better than they are and that they will work very hard
7 to do so if the resources are available to them.

8 I believe that people on the ground are
9 brave and creative and want to live in peace. I believe
10 that we have, by our perverse priorities for war-making
11 and weapons making and dealing, that we have broken our
12 health care system, broken our economy, broken our
13 environment, broken our political system, broken our
14 schools, broken our climate and broken our children and
15 the future that they represent.

16 I believe if we are willing to use the
17 metaphor of brokenness, we can admit to what we have
18 done and join together in hope to fix things. To do so,
19 we have to redeploy our energy and our resources and
20 soon.

21 Or we can continue as we have been. We
22 can continue building bombs while we stand around
23 staring at the shards of our civilization on the floor
24 and, like the sad victims of the broken health care
25 system, simply throw up our hands and wait for the end.

1 At that point the theft threatened by the
2 nuclear arms business -- and it is a business -- will be
3 complete. Thank you.

4 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, ma'am.

5 I have one other speaker on my list, and
6 it's Jim Simms.

7 MR. SIMMS: Thank you. My name is Jim
8 Simms, and while I do not have any prepared remarks, we
9 have submitted letters.

10 I am a City Commissioner here in Amarillo,
11 Texas, and I know that Dr. Brian Eades, one of my fellow
12 commissioners, is going to speak on behalf of the Mayor
13 and City Commission, but I have been attending these
14 meetings for too many years to pass up the opportunity
15 to speak for what I believe is the vast majority of
16 people here in Amarillo.

17 I was the first boy born in Amarillo,
18 Texas in 1941, so Amarillo is a very special place to
19 me.

20 I've raised my family here, I've had a
21 business here, I've involved myself in this community
22 for a number of years and I would like to think that I
23 have a good feel for the attitude of the people of
24 Amarillo and I would like to encourage the continued
25 success and growth that we've enjoyed with Pantex,

1 especially under the new operators, BW.

2 Things are just going too well and this is
3 such an addition and an asset to our community that I
4 would encourage the continued operations that we now
5 enjoy, but also future growth for new projects that come
6 along.

7 I know what the work ethic of the people
8 of Amarillo is and I think it would bode well for the
9 United States, the Department of Energy and for
10 Amarillo, Texas. Thank you.

11 MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

12 All right. Is there anyone else who would
13 like to speak who has not had an opportunity to do so?

14 Okay. I'm going to take a recess in just
15 a couple of minutes, but before I do I would just make a
16 couple of announcements.

17 One is that if you -- when I do take a
18 recess, if you do choose to leave, which I hope you do
19 not, but if you do, I want to thank you very much for
20 coming and especially for some very well presented
21 comments today. I really appreciate that.

22 We are going to be here until 3:00, and if
23 anybody here or if somebody new comes in and would like
24 to make comments for the record, all you have to do is
25 sign up and I will reconvene the hearing at that time.

1 I'll remind you, also, that we have
2 another session this evening, beginning with an open
3 house at 6:00, with the presentations starting at 7:00
4 and probably public testimony starting around 7:30 or
5 quarter of 8:00 and we'll be here until 10:00.

6 The final reminder is that the comments
7 are welcome up through April 10th, and so make note of
8 that, and I think there are probably forms outside at
9 the registration table if you'd like to make comments
10 and submit them in written form today or if you would
11 like to take them and send them later on.

12 So, for now, this meeting is recessed.
13 Thank you.

14 (Recess.)

15 MR. LAWSON: Okay. Thank you very much.
16 Tom Egan, who spoke to us earlier, has asked me if he
17 could have a few more minutes for some comments and some
18 additions to their submission. Mr. Egan, please.

19 MR. EGAN: Would I give the documents I
20 would like to put into the record to you?

21 MR. LAWSON: You may, yes.

22 MR. EGAN: Okay. I would like to name
23 them. I'm pretty sure this document has been entered,
24 but in case it hasn't, I would like to add it, and this
25 is the no production alternative that was presented at

1 Oak Ridge, in case it wasn't.

2 I would like to enter the article by
3 Bishop Thomas Gumbleton on the issue of nuclear weapons
4 as being what he considered the most urgent spiritual
5 question of our time.

6 Thirdly, the Witness of the Faith
7 Communities document, I would like to put that in the
8 record. I would like to enter a -- an article by
9 Dr. Lawrence Britt, called 14 Characteristics of Fascism
10 in the document.

11 And then, since I'm a former teacher of
12 Latin, I thought I would enter in the record a statement
13 from Virgil and I would like to read that.

14 This is found in the first book of Virgil.
15 And, you know, Virgil, he's kind of like the weapons,
16 he's old, too, but he's still reliable and un -- totally
17 unreplacable. But I love Latin, love Virgil.

18 But, anyway, he said this in Book One.
19 Gods of our Fathers, heroes of our land, do not prevent
20 at least this youthful prince from saving a world in
21 ruins, for right and wrong change places, everywhere so
22 many wars. So many shapes of crime confront us.

23 No due honor attends the plow. The
24 fields, bereft of tillers, are all unkempt and
25 throughout the world envious war is raging.

1 That's a long time ago and those words are
2 still pertinent.

3 Now, finally, I would like to make a
4 statement that's not my statement, it's actually from
5 another -- from a principal in school.

6 I have no doubt in my mind that it is
7 brilliant minds and brilliant people who engage and are
8 engaged in this bomb-making business, and I really do
9 not think it's either my place nor my prerogative to
10 question their motives at all, so I set that aside. Not
11 a judgemental statement at all. I consider them
12 brothers and sisters.

13 But this was a note that a principal wrote
14 to his teachers at the beginning of each school year
15 here in the United States and I've saved it and I've
16 kept it because I was so impressed when I heard it the
17 first time.

18 My dear teachers. I am a survivor of a
19 concentration camp. My eyes saw what no one should ever
20 witness: Gas chambers built by brilliant engineers,
21 children poisoned by highly educated physicians, infants
22 killed by very skilled nurses, women and babies shot and
23 burned by high school and college graduates, and so I am
24 suspicious of education.

25 My request is this: Help your students to

1 become human. Your efforts must never produce brilliant
2 monsters, cultured psychopaths, educated Eichmanns.
3 Reading, writing and arithmetic are important only if
4 they serve to make our children more humane. That's the
5 end of his statement.

6 I conclude by decrying the concept of
7 defining national security, even world security, in
8 terms of nuclear weapons, of defining personal security
9 in terms of gun ownership, as so many people do, of
10 defining social civil security in terms of ritual
11 execution of our fellow human beings.

12 Bomb them, shoot them, execute them
13 cannot, must not be our operating ethic, personally,
14 politically or scientifically.

15 So I believe we need a transformation, not
16 of the nuclear weapons complex, but of ourselves.

17 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Egan.

18 Is there anyone else who would like to
19 speak? If not -- yes, ma'am.

20 MS. MONTGOMERY: Can I let -- point out
21 this map over here and --

22 MR. LAWSON: Would you like to come to
23 the podium?

24 MS. MONTGOMERY: -- I don't -- that's not
25 my map.

1 MR. LAWSON: Come up to the podium,
2 please.

3 MS. MONTGOMERY: Okay.

4 THE REPORTER: Could I get your name
5 again, please?

6 MS. MONTGOMERY: Lorita Montgomery. I
7 just want to point out, that's the Ogallala aquifer
8 you're looking at on the middle of that map, and Pantex
9 sits right on it, and that water is valuable for this
10 country, not only this town and this area, but the whole
11 United States and we can't afford to lose it.

12 MR. LAWSON: Okay. Thank you. Is there
13 anyone else who would like to speak now? Okay. If not,
14 we will continue with the recess.

15 As I mentioned earlier, we'll be here
16 until 3:00 o'clock, if any of you would like to speak,
17 or anyone else comes in, I will reopen the hearing.
18 Thank you very much.

19 (Recess.)

20 MR. LAWSON: Okay. It's now five minutes
21 to 3:00 and we have had no other people would have
22 signed up to speak, so I will close this meeting.

23 Before I do, I just would like to thank
24 everybody who participated today, not only for their
25 attendance, but also for the thoughtful comments that

1 were made.

2 And finally I would note that comments
3 will continue to be received by the NNSA up to and
4 including April 10th.

5 This then concludes the hearing on the
6 Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
7 for Complex Transformation Program.

8 This afternoons's hearing is now adjourned
9 at 3:00 and we'll reconvene this evening at 7:00.

10 Thanks.

11 (Hearing adjourned.)

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