

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

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

Draft Complex Transformation Supplemental
Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement

National Nuclear Security Administration
U.S. Department of Energy

Public Hearing
March 11, 2008
6:00 p.m.

Albuquerque Convention Center
Albuquerque, New Mexico

BEFORE: Mr. Theodore A. Wyka

REPORTED BY:
Mary Abernathy Seal, RDR, CRR, CCR 69
Bean & Associates, Inc.
Professional Court Reporting Service
500 Marquette, Northwest, Suite 280
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

(6042A) MAS

1 MR. BROWN: If folks will take their
2 seats, we'll get started with the meeting. Folks
3 standing by the doors, if you can tell the folks out
4 in the hallway we're getting started.

5 Good evening. Welcome to this public
6 hearing on the National Nuclear Security
7 Administration's Supplemental Programmatic
8 Environmental Impact Statement, or supplemental
9 PEIS, on the transformation of the nation's nuclear
10 weapons complex. I hope you have had an opportunity
11 to browse the displays and speak with staff during
12 the just-concluded open house.

13 My name is Holmes Brown. I will serve as
14 the facilitator for this evening's meeting. I'm not
15 an employee of the Department of Energy, nor an
16 advocate for any particular party or position. My
17 role this evening is to ensure that the meeting runs
18 on schedule and that everybody has an opportunity to
19 speak. I will explain some ground rules to assure
20 fair and equitable participation by everyone.

21 At the registration table you should have
22 received a participant's packet which contains
23 information on the transformation of the nuclear
24 weapons complex. If not, please raise your hand,
25 and staff can deliver one to you. Did everyone get

1 one as they registered? Okay.

2 There are two parts to this hearing: The
3 information segment and the formal comments segment.
4 The information segment began with the hour-long
5 open house that has just concluded, and continues
6 with an eight-minute video from Robert Smolen,
7 Deputy Director for Defense Programs. It will be
8 followed by a 20-minute presentation by Mr. Ted
9 Wyka, supplemental PEIS document manager. Mr. Wyka
10 will discuss the complex transformation project and
11 the contents of the supplemental PEIS. The formal
12 comments section will begin immediately after
13 Mr. Wyka's presentation.

14 During the formal comment segment, members
15 of the public will provide their views on the
16 supplemental PEIS. The court reporter will
17 transcribe a verbatim record of your comments. Ted
18 Wyka will be present to hear your comments, but will
19 not be responding to questions. If you wish to make
20 a comment and have not yet signed up to do so,
21 please add your name to the list at the speakers'
22 table in the lobby. Again, I encourage you to do
23 that, because we determine how long each speaker
24 will have based on the number of folks who signed up
25 ahead of time.

1 We now continue the information segment
2 with a video by Mr. Robert Smolen, Deputy
3 Administrator for Defense Programs of the Department
4 of Energy.

5 (Video presentation.)

6 (Oral presentation by Mr. Wyka.)

7 MR. BROWN: It's now time to receive your
8 formal comments on the supplemental PEIS. This is
9 your opportunity to give DOE your views on the draft
10 document. The court reporter is ready to transcribe
11 your statements.

12 Let me review a few ground rules for the
13 formal comments. Please step up to the microphone
14 over there when your name is called, introduce
15 yourself, providing an organizational affiliation
16 where appropriate. If you have a written version of
17 your statement, please pass that on to the court
18 reporter, who is seated right in front of that
19 podium, when you have completed your remarks. I
20 will call two names at a time, the first of the
21 speaker and the second of the person to follow.

22 In view of the number of people who have
23 signed up tonight indicating an interest in
24 speaking, please confine your public statement to
25 four minutes. I will give you a notice when you

1 have a minute remaining. The comments on this
2 document count the same whether they're provided
3 verbally, in writing, faxed or whatever, so if you
4 have a longer statement, if you can summarize your
5 key points and limit your verbal remarks to four
6 minutes, we'd appreciate it.

7 Another reminder, this afternoon we had a
8 symphony of cell phones, and so if folks have a cell
9 phone, if you don't mind either turning it off or
10 putting it at least on silent, the speakers and the
11 court reporter would appreciate it.

12 Ted Wyka will be serving as the hearing
13 officer for the Department of Energy during this
14 formal comment period. With that, let me call on
15 our first speaker. Michael Anatasio will begin, and
16 Glenn Mara to follow. You can correct my
17 pronunciation.

18 MR. ANATASIO: I answer to all kinds of
19 things. Thank you. I am Michael Anatasio, and I'm
20 the director of Los Alamos National Laboratory. I'm
21 here to make three points tonight. First, I want to
22 encourage the NNSA to adopt the preferred
23 alternative and reflect that in the record of
24 decision that they will be developing.

25 Second, on the national scale, I think

1 this preferred alternative, as I'll call it for
2 shorthand, is a very important step forward, because
3 it allows us to transform the nuclear enterprise in
4 this country and transform it in a special way, a
5 way that allows us to reap more efficiencies, to
6 improve our safety and security, and especially to
7 allow us to have more adaptability and
8 responsiveness. And in this way, it will allow the
9 country to be able to reduce the time it takes to
10 respond to any kind of issues that come up with our
11 deterrent.

12 By having a faster response time, this
13 will give the military and the Department of Defense
14 more confidence and allow them to further reduce the
15 number of nuclear weapons in our deterrent
16 stockpile, something that's been going on over many
17 years. And I would just say in the last roughly ten
18 years, the stockpile has come down by about a factor
19 of two, and we look forward to continuing to bring
20 those numbers down further through things like
21 adoption of this preferred alternative.

22 If I think locally to us here in
23 New Mexico, the preferred alternative is also an
24 important step because it validates that Los Alamos
25 National Laboratory will continue to be a national

1 security science laboratory. Since the end of the
2 Cold War and the beginning of the science-based
3 stockpile, this country's approach to maintaining
4 confidence in our nuclear deterrent has been based
5 on a science-based program, a program that draws on
6 the breadth and depth of the science and engineering
7 capability of institutions like Los Alamos National
8 Laboratory. The breadth and depth of that science
9 and technology is so important to allow us to have a
10 deeper understanding of the issues that we have to
11 face with the stockpile as we go forward in time,
12 and allows us to respond to those issues in a way
13 that maintains our confidence but doesn't require
14 the country to go back to nuclear testing.

15 I have the honor to every year write a
16 letter to the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of
17 Energy that ends up with the President and the
18 Congress about, in fact, the technical issues
19 surrounding the stockpile, and whether or not
20 there's a need for that testing. And this
21 science-based --

22 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry, one minute
23 remaining.

24 MR. ANATASIO: And this science base is so
25 important for me to be able to do that. But it's

1 also important because that science base, the
2 breadth and depth, allows us at the same time to do
3 many other things for the country, because as a
4 national laboratory, we're here to help support the
5 country and its grand challenges that it faces. And
6 we are able to garner or to bring together that
7 science base and apply it to challenging problems
8 like proliferation and how do we prevent
9 proliferation around the world, to things like
10 understanding the global climate, to things like
11 understanding how to make more efficient and better
12 solar cells and other alternative energy sources.

13 I would refer you to a little article that
14 was in USA Today about some of those advances that
15 are going on at Los Alamos and also at Sandia
16 National Laboratories. So it's through the science
17 base that's supported by our core mission that
18 allows us to spread our wings and move out into
19 broader areas of national concern, whether it's in
20 other areas of national security or the broad areas
21 of energy security that we're all so concerned
22 about.

23 So thank you for the opportunity to speak,
24 and I again encourage the NNSA to adopt the
25 preferred alternative in their record of decision.

1 Thank you.

2 MR. BROWN: Our next speaker is Glenn
3 Mara, who will be followed by Sally Alice Thompson.

4 MR. MARA: Thank you. My name is Glenn
5 Mara. I'm the principal associate director for the
6 weapons program at the Los Alamos National
7 Laboratory. I'm very pleased to have the
8 opportunity to make a few brief remarks. One of the
9 things that is really important is to summarize that
10 it has my full endorsement of support, and that
11 support is based not only on my personal experience,
12 but over 35 years of working in R&D, weapons and
13 nonweapons, now at two national laboratories. It is
14 an appropriate option and future. It is, in my
15 judgment, the correct preferred alternative, and
16 deserves endorsement with the final record of
17 decision.

18 Let me briefly explain why I have come to
19 that conclusion. First, the preferred alternative
20 talks about a more efficient downsized complex based
21 around centers of excellence in interdependency
22 across the complex, a shared fate that is the best
23 and most reasonable option for the national security
24 mission and at the lowest possible cost and
25 preserving the highest confidence in the science.

1 We maintain our capability at Los Alamos
2 in nuclear design and engineering. We reinforce the
3 importance of high performance computing, which
4 really is a key underpinning of the scientific
5 capability that is crucial to any and all endeavors
6 that we're challenged with to execute for the public
7 interest at the laboratory. And finally, and
8 probably the most visible to some, it identifies
9 Los Alamos as a center of excellence for plutonium
10 R&D and for manufacturing.

11 Perhaps that's the one that deserves the
12 most attention, to me, and it certainly has gotten
13 the most attention from our scientists and engineers
14 to maintain the character of an R&D national
15 laboratory and its greatness and not to see that
16 minimized by taking on a manufacturing or production
17 role.

18 So let me demystify and deconfuse and
19 deconflict possibly some misperceptions. Last year
20 we made 11 pits for the country. That is a
21 capability that had been lost since 1989, and we
22 were asked to maintain the technology capture so
23 that if and when that was required, it could be
24 brought to bear. We're the same laboratory that
25 gave the technical predictions that allowed the

1 decision-makers not to build a major new Rocky
2 Flats. It's that simple. The scientific and
3 technical honesty of the laboratory allowed the
4 decision-makers to make those major prudent
5 decisions. We do not operate in our own
6 self-preservation interest. We try to work our
7 efforts in the collective interests of what's best
8 for national security and for the country.

9 In addition, this year we're going to be
10 asked to make six. That's not the Cold War. It's
11 not even close. When we were in testing in Nevada,
12 each of the two nuclear design labs would make
13 upwards of a couple to three dozen to test and
14 develop weapons for the Cold War. The numbers we
15 made last year, pedigreed at a level that was never
16 possible, demonstrates that we have preserved that
17 capability in the national interest. I am not being
18 asked nor do I know of anybody requiring me to make
19 50 to 80. I'm being asked to preserve a capability,
20 should that at some time in the future become a
21 requirement.

22 MR. BROWN: One minute remaining.

23 MR. MARA: That's the simple framework for
24 that. So let me talk then in the broader context of
25 this preferred alternative, first on the area of

1 safety, changing to a modern replacement facility
2 for a plutonium infrastructure, and that's what the
3 CMRR project does. It replaces a World War II
4 vintage facility and that means my workers, my
5 colleagues, will be safer, and those of my
6 colleagues at Livermore, because we will consolidate
7 their operations to one site. We will reduce both
8 the square footage and the risk, and I have a
9 personal vested interest. I have two grandchildren
10 that live in Los Alamos. I have my coworkers. I
11 want them safe. I want them secure. And that's
12 that second element.

13 The proper protections for security will
14 make this basically an invulnerable fortress.
15 Whether that's an airplane accident, or the maximum
16 credible earthquake in 100,000 years, literally, it
17 will be the last building standing in New Mexico.
18 Let me assure you of that.

19 MR. BROWN: If you can conclude.

20 MR. MARA: I will. And the last part is
21 the most important. We will be more environmentally
22 responsive. There's no question we will reduce the
23 output in efficiencies or processes -- and let me
24 end -- that enables the smaller stockpile. And
25 finally the most important will allow us to preserve

1 the proper balance between science and execution of
2 programs and that means Los Alamos will be able to
3 undertake any problems of a national interest. You
4 have heard some of the range of those that we
5 currently are undertaking and will likely be
6 challenged with in the future. Thank you.

7 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Sally Alice
8 Thompson. And Richard Hostetter follows Sally.

9 MS. THOMPSON: I'm Sally Alice Thompson.
10 I'm a member of Raging Grannies, and also of
11 Veterans for Peace, as of World War II. I was
12 interested in the aspects of the environment that
13 were addressed in this, and land and air quality,
14 but there's one aspect of the environment that was
15 left out, and that is the ethical environment that
16 we live in. The morality and the ethical
17 environment of this country seems to me to be very
18 important, and it seems to me that the Orwellian
19 double-speak we're hearing about, more is less, less
20 is more, and more is less, and war is peace and
21 peace is -- and war is freedom, and enslavement is
22 freedom -- these things -- these Orwellian ideas are
23 not what I grew up with in believing that we had
24 liberty and justice for all in this country.

25 So it seems to me that we need to get away

1 from World War II and the Cold War ethic and move
2 into a new paradigm in the new century of the 2000s,
3 and I hope that you'll listen to the fact that we
4 don't need to make the rest of the world fear us.
5 The rest of the world would rather respect us than
6 fear us.

7 I expected some more Raging Grannies to be
8 here, but nobody else showed up, so I'm going to --
9 I wouldn't say grace you, I'll say punish you -- by
10 singing one of our songs. (Singing.)

11 With nuclear warheads our future's at
12 stake.

13 There's no place to hide, there's no place
14 that's safe.

15 By making more bombs, we're just making
16 more hate.

17 So we say no nukes for our grandchildren's
18 sake.

19 Oh, for our grandchildren's sake.

20 With hills of mine tailings and water
21 pollution,

22 For nuclear waste there is no solution.

23 As women we know someone's got to clean
24 up.

25 So that's why we say, stop making this

1 stuff.

2 Oh, oh, stop making this stuff.

3 They say that we need to replace the old
4 nukes,

5 Build bigger and better and uglier nukes.

6 But we say they're liars, there's too much
7 at stake.

8 So we say no nukes, for our
9 grandchildren's sake. Oh, for our grandchildren's
10 sake.

11 Thank you.

12 MR. BROWN: Richard Hostetter. Robert
13 Ortwine will follow Richard.

14 MR. HOSTETTER: I was sitting here during
15 the open house looking at what was projected up
16 here. I was struck by the oxymoron of the phrase
17 "nuclear security." When we're talking about
18 weapons, nuclear security is like talking about safe
19 sex with an AIDS-infested prostitute. The only
20 nuclear security lies in a world without nuclear
21 weapons. The process of manufacturing them produces
22 huge quantities of terribly toxic waste. We talk
23 about using them safely and securely. But here we
24 are, we're building more, and they're telling us
25 building more will help us to have less. You know,

1 that's not the way I studied math.

2 I also noticed that in the presentations
3 we've heard, we've been presented with all kinds of
4 good-sounding information about how good and
5 efficient this process is. I noticed a definite
6 lack of mention of bringing our program in line with
7 national and international laws which require us to
8 pursue good faith reduction in elimination of
9 nuclear weapons.

10 We talk about preventing proliferation in
11 the same sentence. We're talking about
12 proliferating. You know, what are these people
13 doing to us? At one time we lived in a democracy.
14 My understanding of a democracy is that our elected
15 representatives represent us. The polls I have
16 heard indicate that 70 plus percent of Americans do
17 not want more nuclear weapons.

18 These polls also indicate that the same
19 percentage of American citizens want us to get rid
20 of the nukes we have, as we are legally obligated to
21 do by treaty. Our elected representatives, Domenici
22 and Udall in particular, are not representing us.
23 They're representing instead some very narrow
24 interests of money and privilege which wants this
25 new bomb factory. And they can call it whatever

1 they want. It is a bomb factory. Unless we the
2 people can figure out how to hold these
3 representatives accountable, we will continue to
4 spend the money that should go for schools and
5 alternative energy and health care and other good
6 things in the rat hole of a new bomb factory.

7 MR. BROWN: One minute remaining.

8 MR. HOSTETTER: And no matter all the fine
9 rhetoric, it is a bomb factory. Those who are
10 supposed public servants who are persisting in
11 spending our tax dollars in this wasteful and
12 destructive fashion will at some point in time need
13 to answer for their actions in supporting this
14 insanity. And I would just like to end with a
15 question for these public servants. I would like to
16 ask you if you are proud of your role in railroading
17 this plan through over the wishes of the citizens of
18 America. Thank you.

19 MR. BROWN: Robert Ortwine? Is Robert
20 here? Our next speaker is Mark Doppke. And he will
21 be followed by Joan Woodard.

22 MR. DOPPKE: My name is Mark Doppke, and
23 I'm going to provide additional comments in writing,
24 but I'd just like to say briefly that, first off, I
25 do support the labs and the wonderful work they do.

1 I wish we could use them to investigate climate
2 change or renewable energy instead, but since
3 nuclear weapons aren't going away, I think that
4 reducing the size and scope of the facilities
5 increasing the security is a good step. It's long
6 overdue. I can't specifically speak to the
7 capability-based alternative, but that does seem to
8 be the best one, because it has the lowest
9 production of warheads available. I don't really
10 need to provide much evidence to say that pit
11 production is damaging to the environment since
12 Rocky Flats has indicated that and is closed now,
13 but it does seem that our nuclear facilities are
14 spread out all over the country right now and that a
15 consolidation is in order. That's all for now.
16 Thank you.

17 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Joan Woodard. And
18 Daniel Erdman would be next.

19 MS. WOODARD: Hi. My name is Joan
20 Woodard. I'm a citizen of Albuquerque for 19 years
21 and the deputy director of Sandia for the weapons
22 program. I'm in the process for the development of
23 the draft complex transformation, SPEIS. Sandia
24 contributed heavily and was involved in supporting
25 the analysis, and we support the preferred

1 alternative as defined in the sections of the SPEIS.
2 I'd also like to publicly thank the leadership of
3 NNSA for their tremendous work in this effort, and
4 also specifically thank Dr. George Allen for his
5 leadership and personal dedication to this effort.
6 In particular, Sandia has seen and sees the enormous
7 benefits of the consolidation of special nuclear
8 material.

9 We're committed to this notion and see the
10 value, in terms of security, in reducing safeguards
11 and security costs, and as of February of this year,
12 we are no longer an SNM category 1/category 2
13 possessing site within the complex. We also see
14 great advantages for the identification of critical
15 functions within the complex and the designation of
16 centers of excellence for these critical functions.
17 This explicit identification and designation allows
18 us to eliminate unneeded redundancies and,
19 therefore, reduce the cost and expense associated
20 with those.

21 In this capacity, Sandia is committed to
22 lead the science and engineering for nonnuclear
23 components, as well as to be the lead for a major
24 testing, nonnuclear testing associated with the
25 weapons program, as well as high explosives research

1 and development for small devices that are also part
2 of the nuclear weapons program.

3 We at Sandia recognize the likelihood of
4 changes nationally in the nuclear weapons program
5 and join with other sites in the complex and NNSA in
6 dedicating ourselves to the stewardship of the
7 deterrent but also, at the same time, seeking to
8 efficiently utilize the facilities and capabilities
9 in a very efficient way and seeking consolidations
10 wherever appropriate.

11 We are committed to working with DOE and
12 NNSA for the new stewardship and sponsorship model
13 for our Sandia California site that will enable us
14 to maintain the essential systems engineering
15 capability for the weapons program while freeing up
16 those capabilities for serving the nation in other
17 key national issues and energy. We are also
18 deliberate in our efforts to ensure that we have
19 facilities and capabilities that are important to
20 the nation to sustain nuclear deterrent and be
21 available for the nation's national security issues
22 today and tomorrow.

23 An example of that is the microsystems
24 engineering and science applications facility that
25 was recently completed. That provides a capability

1 for small microsystem devices that can be used for
2 enhancing safety and security of weapons as well as
3 other national security applications, and also for
4 the application of high-performance computing and
5 modeling simulation for our responsibility that
6 underpins our design certification.

7 MR. BROWN: One minute remaining.

8 MS. WOODARD: We also acknowledge that
9 properly sizing our nuclear weapons work force is
10 very important, and NNSA has set a goal of 20 to 30
11 percent reduction over the course of ten years. We
12 at Sandia have sought to do that and have pursued
13 that effort in concert with NNSA by, in fact,
14 reducing the size of our nuclear weapons oriented
15 work force by over 15 percent from October 2003 to
16 the present, by directing those scientists and
17 engineers to other important national security
18 issues.

19 So in conclusion, we are also deliberate
20 in maintaining our critical skills and sustaining
21 our critical skills within our work force through
22 hiring and mentoring graduates from top universities
23 throughout the country so that we ensure we have the
24 knowledge and the expertise, the science and
25 engineering, to address the nation's national

1 security issues today and in the future. Thank you.

2 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Daniel Erdman will
3 be followed by Dave Clark.

4 MR. ERDMAN: Hello, my name is Daniel
5 Erdman. I'm pastor of Iglesia Congregacion Unida,
6 United Church of Christ, which you may guess is a
7 Spanish-speaking congregation. I also work with
8 youth in New Mexico who are considered to be at high
9 risk of incarceration, particularly paroled youth.

10 We've been asked to address the
11 environmental impact of the complex transformation
12 today. So as I think about the environmental impact
13 of this project, I have to conclude that it would be
14 a step to a disaster. Thanks to our fossil fuel
15 profligacy over the past hundred years, global
16 warming presents the greatest environmental
17 catastrophe the human race has ever faced. But
18 instead of putting our best and brightest scientific
19 minds to work as hard as possible on how best to
20 respond to global warming, the complex
21 transformation project will continue to employ many
22 of these minds solving a nonproblem: That is, how
23 to produce more efficient nuclear bombs.

24 Secondly, the plutonium pit production
25 slated for Los Alamos will further damage the

1 environment. Damage to the physical environment
2 will be increased by the production of plutonium
3 with its huge disposal problems, so it's obvious
4 that needs no further comment. But the effect on
5 the world environment will be damaging, as well.
6 Around the world, millions of impoverished people
7 resent the United States and the neoliberal world
8 economy that enriches us at the expense of other
9 people. This environment of hatred and fear, which
10 has been only exacerbated by the current
11 administration, will only worsen as they perceive
12 the United States not be content with having 10,000
13 plutonium pits, making more right here in
14 Los Alamos, and making more sophisticated nuclear
15 weapons.

16 The most obvious product of that
17 environment is terrorism against which nuclear
18 weapons are not only not any kind of effective
19 weapon, but actually potentially provide weapons to
20 the terrorists. The production of nuclear weapons
21 in new numbers will not provide greater national
22 security, but rather less.

23 And finally, if the purpose of our
24 treaties and our intentions is to reduce the number
25 of nuclear weapons, then the logical way of

1 proceeding would be to reduce the number of nuclear
2 weapons. As was said earlier by another speaker,
3 the issue is not with the staff of the NNSA who are
4 present here today, but rather with those who create
5 the laws of this country, with those who supposedly
6 represent the will of the people in our government,
7 with those whom we have elected to do the will of
8 the people, and so I suggest that everyone here
9 write to Congressman Udall, Senator Domenici,
10 Senator Bingaman, and express your opinion
11 unceasingly. Thank you.

12 MR. BROWN: Dave Clark will be followed by
13 David McCoy.

14 MR. CLARK: Hello. My name is David
15 Clark, and I'm a Los Alamos National Laboratory
16 fellow. The rank of fellow is awarded to the top 2
17 percent of the lab scientific staff. I'm also the
18 director of the Seaborg Institute for Transactinium
19 Science, and I come here today also as a citizen to
20 tell you that I represent a new generation of
21 scientists at Los Alamos National Laboratories and
22 at all the national labs. I have devoted my career
23 to cleaning up the legacy of the Cold War. My
24 efforts have helped reduce the number of nuclear
25 weapons. My efforts have helped support the ban on

1 underground nuclear tests, and my efforts have
2 helped clean up the environmental contamination of
3 the Cold War.

4 I submit to you that my goals are the same
5 as many of the rest of you here in the room. Where
6 we differ is how we approach achieving these goals.
7 I support the complex transformation. I believe the
8 complex transformation represents a natural and
9 logical means to achieve further legacy cleanup
10 goals. It will cut the size of the nuclear weapons
11 complex in half, it will support reducing the number
12 of nuclear weapons, it will replace aging facilities
13 with state of the art laboratories with better
14 safety, better security, and better environmental
15 compliance. New facilities are crucial and I say
16 that as a scientific leader I want to remind
17 everyone that there's well over 2,000 metric tons of
18 plutonium throughout the world today in various
19 forms.

20 Regardless of your views on how this
21 situation came to be, it is clear that these large
22 inventories will need to be prudently managed for
23 many centuries. My generation did not create this
24 legacy. My generation inherited this legacy, and my
25 generation is trying to solve the problem. And

1 frankly, we could use the support of the local
2 communities and the support of our politicians in
3 helping us to solve these problems.

4 To succeed, we're going to have to improve
5 our understanding of plutonium by continuing to work
6 at the frontiers of science and continuing to
7 attract and retain the best and brightest talent of
8 the next generation, because again, these
9 inventories aren't going away anytime soon. We're
10 going to need to conduct our work in modern, safe,
11 secure facilities like the proposed CMR replacement.

12 And I'd also like to say that a limited
13 production capacity for Los Alamos is not
14 incompatible with state-of-the-art science. In
15 fact, I believe that it will enhance and expand our
16 scientific capabilities by giving us modern
17 facilities to work on the new missions that have
18 been proposed. Many have said that we should be
19 working on countering terrorism, on alternative
20 energy, working on energy security. We should be
21 working on health and environmental cleanup.

22 In fact, the labs are doing all of those
23 things, but we could do much, much more and for
24 that, we need our politicians to make sure that the
25 funding is in the budget. We can't just move money

1 from mission A to mission B. That's, in fact,
2 illegal, and I would go to jail for that. We can't
3 do that. So we really need community support and
4 political support to take on these additional
5 messages, or these additional missions. So thank
6 you for your time.

7 MR. BROWN: Dave McCoy. Tiska Blankenship
8 will follow David McCoy.

9 MR. McCOY: Good evening. It's so
10 refreshing to hear about these -- what they call
11 them -- centers for extermination. First of all,
12 I'd like to start off by asking for an extension of
13 the comment period past the April 10th time period.
14 The cumulative impacts upon New Mexico have not been
15 appropriately analyzed by this supplemental
16 environmental impact statement. We have new things
17 that are going to be occurring at Sandia
18 Laboratories, at LANL laboratories. We have the
19 WIPP transportation route, and now we're talking
20 also about moving the Tonopah test range to White
21 Sands. So what we have, instead of a consolidation
22 for New Mexico, is kind of a proliferation of
23 additional effects.

24 Now, I want to address these remarks
25 specifically to June Woodard over there, from

1 Sandia. You know, Sandia has a terrible track
2 record of cleaning up some of its facilities here.
3 The mixed waste landfill has over 700,000 cubic feet
4 of hazardous radioactive waste and online pits and
5 trenches over Albuquerque's drinking water supply.
6 Sandia continues to plan for open air burning at the
7 thermal treatment unit for explosives, and
8 contaminated waste without the necessary air
9 monitoring systems or pollution controls for
10 contamination to the air. The open burning releases
11 toxic chemical into the air people breathe in
12 Albuquerque. There's seismic issues under the
13 Manzano bunker facility.

14 I looked recently at a map that you have
15 to go up to the New Mexico ED office to get hold of.
16 They won't put it on the web site here. And it
17 shows the Tijeras fault going directly through and
18 directly beneath one of the Manzano bunkers, and
19 then there's two earthquake faults going kind of
20 northwest/southwest, on either side of Manzano. So
21 that's an issue.

22 Sandia fails to address the waste with no
23 place to go, which is in the yard holes. These were
24 over 30 primitive open holes dug deep into the
25 ground to contain waste from experiments simulating

1 nuclear meltdowns that involved nuclear reactor
2 fuels that had been shipped in canisters to Sandia
3 from reactors around the world.

4 Now, additionally, you have got an
5 environmental justice issue that you have not
6 addressed for LANL. You have got 57,000 people who
7 are minority and low-income persons. You also have
8 the same kind of minority status around Sandia in
9 the pueblos and with the Hispanic population. You
10 have not addressed the environmental justice issues.
11 You have not addressed the 175,000 kilograms of
12 additional hazardous waste that are going to be
13 generated every year at Sandia National Laboratories
14 if you go ahead with these increased --

15 MR. BROWN: You have got about a minute
16 left.

17 MR. McCOY: There's numerous facilities
18 out there at Sandia that are going to be involved in
19 this weapons business. The neutron generator
20 protection facility -- they're going to be releasing
21 tritium into our environment. There's no air
22 monitoring that I know of for this facility. They
23 want to transfer the flight test operations. They
24 have explosive test sites. These are three outdoor
25 burn areas for explosives. Cleanup isn't addressed

1 in your EIS. You have numerous cumulative
2 environmental impacts that aren't analyzed. Global
3 nuclear energy partnership putting in advance fuel
4 cycle operation at LANL. That's going to increase
5 water to 754 million gallons per year. Where is
6 LANL going to get all that water? And how much
7 pollution are they going to put into that water
8 after they have used it?

9 The same thing at Sandia. They're using
10 over 550 million gallons a year. That's water that
11 they're contaminating over the primary portion of
12 Albuquerque's drinking water aquifer, you know?

13 Thank you very much.

14 MS. BLANKENSHIP: I wanted to say to the
15 men who have been here tonight testifying on behalf
16 of this complex, you live in a different world than
17 I do, and I'm sure you are sincere in your desire to
18 protect the United States citizens, your families,
19 and so forth. But I believe that you are very out
20 of touch with the heart of the US population. I do
21 not trust that these hearings will mean anything or
22 change anything, based on the established record of
23 the current administration and the government and
24 the hypocritical bullying that we are doing around
25 the world.

1 I oppose all pit production, not just some
2 production, and by this I mean that when you say
3 some pit production, you are obviously implying that
4 there will be production. We have a superabundance
5 of extra pits and weapons and that does not include
6 about 15,000 extra pits of which about 5,000 have
7 been designated as strategic reserves. The pits we
8 have now will last 100 plus years already. We
9 haven't cleaned up the waste already created from
10 past years. WIPP will be closed in 2035. There is
11 no current plan for the current new production of
12 this waste. We need to divest from mass destruction
13 and start building communities, both global and
14 national, emphasize infrastructure, relationships,
15 civic responsibilities. We need a vision for
16 cooperative and harmonious future.

17 I have a problem with the terms that are
18 continued to be used that imply the spiritual, such
19 as complex transformation. It's another metaphor
20 instead of just stating the truth, a complex death
21 proliferation. I would fully support the
22 transformation of the complex into green jobs and
23 industries with a mission of bringing people
24 together cooperatively around the world. I do not
25 want to expand our capability to kill human beings.

1 I oppose this new complex.

2 MR. BROWN: Our next speaker is Astrid
3 Weloster, and Greg Mello will follow.

4 MS. WELOSTER: Hi, my name is Astrid
5 Weloster, and I was here this morning, so I won't
6 bore you by saying the same thing again. But I
7 really am sort of at a loss for words. I have been
8 going to these hearings for about five years now,
9 and by and large they have been packed with citizens
10 who say, "No more nuclear weapons. Not now, not
11 ever."

12 That's what our law, the NPT, says
13 worldwide. And if you want to prove to us that
14 there will not be a negative impact of these new
15 weapons of new pit production at Los Alamos, of the
16 CMRR building, and all the other misleading acronyms
17 that you're using, I would like you to invite a
18 delegation of the NPT signatory nations that are not
19 building nuclear weapons, because I would tell you
20 the extent of betrayal that you who work for the
21 labs and the NNSA have visited on these very honest
22 people who are still living by what they signed on
23 to, I think they should come to Los Alamos and tell
24 us that what you say is true, that you're not
25 contaminating the earth beyond all reparation.

1 We need the money -- what it is now -- \$7
2 trillion we've spent on this folly. We need that to
3 save this planet for our children. The average
4 newborn now is born with 200 chemicals in its
5 system. We are talking about babies that are waste
6 dumps. We are talking about new nuclear weapons
7 that you want to be more responsive? That means we
8 drop them on children faster. It means their eyes
9 will melt out of their heads faster. It means they
10 will be vaporized in their little tracks faster.

11 Is that what you want of your nation? I
12 don't. And personally, for Congressman Udall's
13 benefit, I would like a show of hands of how many of
14 you are on the payroll of these forthcoming new
15 nuclear weapons. I would like a raise of hands.
16 Most of you are wearing these little white badges.
17 I would like to see hands.

18 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: I know there are
19 more.

20 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: Thank you for
21 being honest.

22 MS. WELOSTER: I know there's somebody in
23 the audience, or at least was, who has signed the
24 call for disarmament, saying you probably don't know
25 this, but I am an abolitionist. This person designs

1 these horrendous things and thinks the road to
2 disarmament is through new nuclear weapons. So I'm
3 proposing to all of you that don't work for the
4 government and that don't think that the National
5 Nuclear Safety Administration means anything but
6 safer nukes for these people to surround themselves
7 with, I'd like you to camp on your representative's
8 doorstep. I would like all the people who are
9 running for office to answer what are they going to
10 do with the waste and why do we need more weapons on
11 the road to disarmament?

12 No more pits, no CMRR, no more bullshit.

13 Thank you.

14 MR. BROWN: Greg Mello is next. And
15 William Beems will follow Greg.

16 MR. MELLO: Thank you. I feel like I have
17 been in these hearings -- it's a recurring nightmare
18 for two decades. And the same things get said and
19 the same things get done. We're still fighting the
20 same battles. At least there isn't yet a brand-new
21 pit facility at Los Alamos, although that seems to
22 be the core of the issue in this matter here this
23 evening. So the CMRR is the central thing in this
24 environmental impact statement process. There's a
25 lot of things being discussed, many pieces going

1 here and there, but the main pea under the walnut
2 shell here is the new pit facility. Some of you who
3 work for the Department of Energy know Everet
4 Beckner. Everet Beckner said to me a couple of
5 years ago that this was the pivotal facility in the
6 entire future of the weapons complex. He said if
7 we're going to make any new weapons, we're going to
8 make them at Los Alamos and so we need this -- it's
9 going to be the next 15 years, this is the most
10 pivotal thing.

11 So that's from Ev Beckner. But that is
12 not what is being said to our newspapers by the
13 laboratory these days. And I want to draw attention
14 to what appears to many of us to be a full court
15 public relations press by the laboratory because
16 they feel I think that their proposals are under
17 attack. Today I heard that -- and I don't know
18 whether this is true, so I just offer it as a rumor,
19 but I think the source is very reliable -- that the
20 laboratory had retained the Burson-Marsteller PR
21 firm to work for them, and their clients include
22 Black Water, the Indonesian government after the
23 East Timor genocide. This is the type of company
24 which has become -- this is what science comes to
25 here after Hiroshima, you know? Hiroshima in some

1 ways was the period at the end of the scientific
2 sentence, when science became fully prostituted to
3 national power. And what we hear a lot of these
4 days is the rhetoric of science and objectivity. We
5 have to be fair and balanced, and this ideology,
6 which used to have some substance to it, has become
7 the ever-elastic flexible servant of power and
8 privilege and domination.

9 We have to be aware of this ideology.

10 It's the most powerful thing under which the
11 privileges for a wealthy few and for an empire would
12 seek to dominate the planet, pursue their agenda.
13 This is not about national security. This is about
14 the privilege for a few. It is about taking food
15 from children. That's what this is about. It's
16 about Wall Street getting richer. It's about making
17 sure that our country does not spend money on
18 low-income home weatherization, so it can spend
19 money on a new plutonium facility at Los Alamos
20 National Laboratory.

21 MR. BROWN: You have got about 40 seconds.

22 MR. MELLO: All this sounds quite solid
23 when it's presented here, but the House of
24 Representatives and even the Bush White House, the
25 Pentagon, are not 1,000 percent behind these

1 proposals and they have been heavily cut in the
2 house for five years running and they were zeroed
3 out last year. We are fortunate to have Congressman
4 Udall's aide here, Sarah Cobb. Sarah, if people
5 want to work with Congressman Udall to develop a
6 sustainable path for New Mexico, would you work with
7 them?

8 MS. COBB: Yes. Here are my cards.

9 MR. MELLO: There we go. So please work
10 with Congressman Udall. Help them move away from
11 the laboratories and make our communities the
12 laboratories of change that we need. Thank you very
13 much.

14 MR. BROWN: Thanks, Greg. William Beems
15 is next, and Don Schrader follows him.

16 MR. BEEMS: Mr. Wyka, my name is William
17 Beems. I'm an elementary school educator here in
18 the Albuquerque Public School system. I work day in
19 and day out encouraging our children to learn how to
20 use their words. This seems to be a message
21 completely lost on our current administration, and
22 all of those who rallied in support of their
23 bellicose world view. Beyond the fear-mongering
24 that is inherent in the bomb plex complex
25 transformation approach, my further concerns include

1 the open burn and detonation policy of the labs at a
2 time when the public is prevented from burning
3 ordinary rubbish, the threat of radioactive waste to
4 the water supplies of the entire Rio Grande
5 watershed, and the insanity of the pursuit of
6 nuclear weapons.

7 In lieu of a rational response on the part
8 of nuclear lackeys, I wish only to state my
9 irrevocable opposition to the madness that began
10 30-plus years ago with the Carter administration
11 when this area was designated a national sacrifice
12 area. We do not need more nuclear weapons. We do
13 not need nuclear pits, i.e., triggers. We do need
14 an earnest, dedicated effort for the ongoing cleanup
15 of the septic nightmare that is Los Alamos today and
16 all the other nuclear establishments around this
17 country. This SPEIS is inadequate. It should be
18 revised. It should be reissued for further public
19 comment. Thank you.

20 MR. BROWN: Don Schrader. Anne Sensenig
21 will follow Don.

22 MR. SCHRADER: There is no right way to do
23 evil. There is no right way for the US empire to
24 commit international terrorism, holding the nations
25 of the world hostage. Sandia and Los Alamos weapons

1 labs daily, for decades, have prepared to commit
2 mass murders worldwide, thousands of times larger
3 than the atrocities of September 11th, 2001. US
4 nuclear weapons terrorize many nations. US nuclear
5 weapons threaten to incinerate many times more moms,
6 dads, and kids than Hitler and the concentration
7 camps and the gas ovens and all of World War II
8 combined, many times more. US nuclear weapons are
9 prepared to slaughter far more people than all the
10 wars of human history combined. And even if the US
11 never again drops nuclear bombs on cities, these
12 bombs are murdering millions of poor people right
13 now because the billions of dollars, the vast
14 resources, the brain power invested in weapons of
15 mass destruction could provide clean water, decent
16 shelter, nutritious food, for millions of poor
17 people, dying worldwide.

18 US weapons of mass destruction are aimed
19 to murder far more human beings than all the victims
20 of street gangs, drug dealers, drunk drivers, sex
21 offenders, deranged spouses, serial killers, the Ku
22 Klux Klan, and the Mafia combined. Let's face the
23 truth. Let's quit lying. No salary is worth
24 prostituting your brain. No salary is worth
25 prostituting your conscience. No salary is worth

1 prostituting your career to the worst of all
2 criminal insanities.

3 I have paid no federal income tax for
4 nuclear weapons and for war for 29 years, and I
5 pledge tonight at age 62 that I will never pay one
6 penny of federal income tax the rest of my life for
7 nuclear weapons and for war. And I appeal to all of
8 you here tonight who oppose nuclear weapons and war
9 to stop, now and forever, paying for the weapons you
10 say you oppose.

11 MR. BROWN: There's a minute left.

12 MR. BEEMS: The best way to refuse federal
13 income tax for nuclear weapons and war, with no
14 threat and no fine from the government, is to live
15 simply below the federal income taxable level. I
16 live well, well, last year 2007, on \$3,542. I write
17 down every penny, considerably less than one-half
18 the federal income taxable level for me as a single
19 person under 65. I have no right to more than I
20 need while others in this world have less than they
21 need. And I have no right, no right, to pay tax to
22 do to other people what I do not want them to do to
23 me.

24 MR. BROWN: Suzanne Zigler.

25 MS. ZIGLER: You have invited comment on

1 an environmental impact statement, and I have to
2 wonder what integrity lies behind that invitation.
3 I know that newspapers are not always accurate in
4 the way that they describe different things, but
5 when the New Mexico Environmental Department raised
6 environmental inquiries at LANL about environmental
7 safety, they are answered with a resounding, "No, we
8 didn't do anything."

9 New Mexico ED says, "Yes, you did."

10 The man back at LANL said, "No, we
11 didn't," and this went on in a sort of childish
12 exchange. His replies made the New York governor
13 taking responsibility for his actions almost
14 refreshing. Your invitation frames the argument.
15 The assumption is that we will have this production,
16 and for many of the people here, that assumption is
17 the problem. When will there be a hearing on that?
18 One of our senators won't even meet with people who
19 are opposed to nuclear projects of any kind. We
20 have few alternatives to make change, even though,
21 as it's been mentioned many times tonight, over 70
22 percent of the citizens in this country are opposed
23 to nuclear weapons and support the nonproliferation
24 treaty.

25 I can only hope that at some point before

1 people like you have been instrumental in poisoning
2 the land and waters of the planet through your
3 actions, both direct and indirect, that you will
4 stop being good Germans. You do have the ability to
5 influence policy. If your role in enabling the
6 manufacturing of nuclear weapons gets to the world
7 court, then remember one of Adolf Eichmann's
8 defenses. He said he didn't know he was doing
9 anything wrong. He simply arranged for trains to be
10 full. Human cargo there, and hair, teeth, jewelry,
11 clothing, back. Thank you.

12 MR. BROWN: Kevin Bean? And Ann Harrison
13 will follow.

14 MR. BEAN: I appreciate all the work
15 that's gone into the proposal that we've heard about
16 this evening, and I don't question the dedication of
17 LANL or Sandia staff with regard to the work they're
18 doing and their commitment to this country and to
19 national security. In fact, I applaud it. I think
20 everyone should show an equal degree of commitment
21 to making this country and world a better place.

22 The premise, however, I believe is wrong
23 with regard to this proposal, that premise being
24 that continued production of nuclear weapons is
25 going to strengthen our national security. It's my

1 belief that the opposite is true, and that continued
2 production of nuclear weapons will weaken this
3 country and will destabilize the world.

4 New production of nuclear weapons,
5 regardless of how it's justified or explained, I
6 believe is going to be seen by the rest of the world
7 for what it is, an escalation of weapons production
8 and a repudiation of the nonproliferation treaty,
9 which is one of the most successful international
10 treaties, from what I have read, that's ever been
11 adopted by this country and by the rest of the
12 world. In fact, it's my understanding that it's the
13 nonproliferation treaty that is largely responsible
14 for having prevented the widespread proliferation of
15 nuclear weapons around the world, and hasn't been
16 the so-called deterrence provided by the United
17 States nuclear stockpiles. It's been an
18 international agreement that was signed off on by
19 the United States and the other nuclear powers and
20 something like 150 nonnuclear states, all of whom
21 agreed that the world is a much safer place without
22 nuclear weapons.

23 Furthermore, the NPT obligates the United
24 States and the other nuclear powers and all the
25 nonnuclear states to work toward total nuclear

1 disarmament. And this policy that we're operating
2 under today is a complete refutation of that treaty
3 and of what it obligates this country and the rest
4 of the world to do.

5 MR. BROWN: One minute left.

6 MR. BEAN: I checked the Bulletin of the
7 Atomic Scientists before I came down. I was looking
8 at various things, trying to think about what to say
9 tonight. I see that their doomsday clock has been
10 moved to five minutes to midnight sometime in the
11 last couple of years, I guess, in response to
12 several developments, including the testing of a
13 nuclear weapon by North Korea, the presence of all
14 the unsecured nuclear materials in the world and
15 including the military posturing by the United
16 States which now says that the nuclear weapons have
17 a strategic role to play in our national security.

18 It's my view that the real threat in the
19 world today is not -- well, there are many, but if
20 you haven't had a chance, you should take a look at
21 Plan B by Lester Brown. We're on the verge of
22 civilizational collapse, not just one country going
23 down, one state, but the world going down. LANL,
24 Sandia, the other preeminent scientific institutions
25 around the world definitely have a role to play in

1 addressing these very serious problems the world is
2 facing. We don't need this distraction of new
3 nuclear weapons production to keep us from
4 addressing these very serious problems that the
5 world is facing today. And by the way, the EIS --
6 you really need a no-production alternative in this
7 EIS. That's what people are clamoring for and, no,
8 you're saying you can't do it, but it ought to be in
9 there. That's what people want. Thank you very
10 much.

11 MR. BROWN: Ann Harrison, to be followed
12 by Dick Harrison.

13 MS. HARRISON: I'm Ann Harrison, and I
14 represent myself. I also represent a lot of
15 grandmas and mothers and children all over the
16 world. I cannot believe the insanity of this
17 decision, and when I read this, I thought, you don't
18 even have it open for a "none." You said let's
19 tweak it a little bit here and tweak it a little bit
20 there. That's what we're looking for, and then
21 we're going to change it.

22 Well, it really discourages me, because I
23 don't see any future in this at all. And one of the
24 saddest things I heard this afternoon was when the
25 young man got up and he talked about his generation

1 and all of this -- I think he was at Los Alamos. I
2 don't remember which lab he was at. But it made me
3 so sad because he started, "Oh, we're doing all
4 these wonderful things, we're going to improve the
5 environment, we're going to be that," and then at
6 the end of his statement, at the same time, "But we
7 can't do that unless we get the money for this."

8 And to me, it's a little bit like saying,
9 "We want to save all the people, but we've got to
10 have an oven where we kill some other people, in
11 order to do it."

12 And to me, that's what we're doing with
13 this nuclear business. We're saying, "Are you ever
14 really going to use it?"

15 We did use it once. And I don't trust our
16 government not to use it again. But how could you
17 possibly drop a nuclear bomb where people are going
18 to burn and die and have no guilt? Do you have no
19 guilt about any of this?

20 And the other thing that worries me is
21 what you're doing to our environment. Who was it
22 that said New Mexico was the forgotten land, or not
23 important? Well, that's how I feel you're acting.
24 It's not just New Mexico. But we certainly have
25 been on the end of a lot of this with our air, with

1 our water. You talk about environmental standards.
2 You don't even take those standards -- how much
3 water do we have? I have been hearing people talk
4 about -- I had a very good friend -- I was in Ohio
5 this last week and she said, "I'd like to move to
6 New Mexico, but I understand the water's going to
7 run out."

8 And I said, "Well, it probably will," the
9 way we're using it. And then I hear of all these
10 thousands of gallons you're using, and you're
11 destroying, and that doesn't bother you? I mean, I
12 hope you can sleep well at night. Thank you.

13 MR. BROWN: Dick Harrison. Paul Eichhorn
14 will follow Dick.

15 MR. HARRISON: I'm Dick Harrison, retired
16 Presbyterian minister and volunteer Albuquerque
17 police chaplain. I recall about a year after the
18 war in Iraq was underway, I saw a poster. It said,
19 "Weapons of mass destruction: Iraq zero,
20 Albuquerque 2000."

21 And I have thought ever since that time
22 that that's one of the problems that we have in this
23 world and in our country. We are so concerned that
24 some little country will get a nuclear weapon, and
25 we have more nuclear weapons than all the rest of

1 the world put together. And you know, we really
2 can't use them without destroying the earth, without
3 destroying our own home. I think to talk about
4 nuclear weapons as a way of national security is
5 stupid. They surely didn't help at 9/11. And where
6 could you use them to fight terrorism? They are
7 terrorism.

8 I think that I would like to suggest that
9 you have four possible things that could be looked
10 at tonight. We might want to add a fifth one, which
11 suggests that we figure out some ways to begin to
12 cut back on these nuclear weapons and to work with
13 other countries in the world who want to do that,
14 too, and see if we can't build a peaceful world.
15 Thank you.

16 MR. BROWN: Paul Eichhorn.

17 MR. EICHHORN: I was mesmerized. That was
18 a good speech.

19 MR. BROWN: And Janice Evans will be
20 following Paul.

21 MR. EICHHORN: Jesus said there's no room
22 in heaven for liars. And this is all based on a
23 bunch of big damn lies. The biggest lie is
24 disassembly of nuclear weapons, some sort of
25 equivalent to getting rid of them. All these pits

1 that are being stored everywhere aren't being gotten
2 rid of. They're being stored. A pit is an atom
3 bomb. Any third-world country with a technical
4 university can turn out a pretty good bomb. It may
5 fizzle, but it will be a pretty satisfying fizzle.

6 Funny story. About the year 2000, Bill
7 Richardson was Secretary of Energy. They did a
8 little study up at Los Alamos, led to the "garden
9 cart incident." They had a squad go to Los Alamos,
10 and they proved that they could jump a nuclear
11 facility, catch it with the vaults open, stack up
12 enough plates of enriched uranium so that a stack of
13 their conventional explosives that they could have
14 brought along with them would have brought a pretty
15 crappy fizzle bomb. Yield, tops, ten kilotons.
16 Figure just Nagasaki.

17 Well, this is kind of interesting to us
18 here. This is Albuquerque down here. Kirtland Air
19 Force Base. There's the airport. This is you.
20 This right here is the cloak hanger. It's
21 recognizable from outer space. 1914 nuclear weapons
22 stored there. They haven't been processed on the
23 pits, yet this is all the care that they have shown
24 to us in the past with how they plan their nuclear
25 programs.

1 Because they have shown themselves to be
2 totally lacking in being trustworthy, we cannot
3 trust them now. Right now we have a president who's
4 the greatest liar of American history. And we have
5 an evil Dick Cheney who wants to figure out ways to
6 use nuclear weapons on a surgical strike against
7 Iran. Well, the most important scientific
8 discovery, all you engineers out there, that
9 happened in the history of mankind was done by one
10 Carl Sagan. He figured out that anything more than
11 300 megatons of nuclear weapons put on cities caused
12 the end of the world and nuclear winter.

13 This leads to some interesting nuclear
14 mass. That means that, oh, we can't take on the
15 people with a lot of weapons, because even a
16 successful nuclear first strike, you know, they
17 count that at 90 percent. That means we can pick on
18 little countries with our nuclear weapons because if
19 we take out China, because we developed technology
20 for it, you know, that may not sit well with Russia,
21 so we'll probably have to take out China, and
22 Russia, too, and doggone, you know, India has a lot
23 of nuclear weapons, maybe 100, and so does Pakistan.
24 So, gee, like they may not trust us next. We'll
25 have to take them out, too.

1 And doing this all under the 300 megaton
2 nuclear budget is an impossibility. You guys are
3 working on a big damn lie. All of you. Ted, I feel
4 sorry for you. You have got a terrible job. I felt
5 sorry for you last year when you should have gotten
6 a new job by this year. But --

7 MR. BROWN: You have got about one minute
8 left.

9 MR. EICHHORN: Thank you. But you guys
10 are nothing but organized war criminals. I know you
11 all are nice, you know, good, and you speak well,
12 but there's nothing that your weapons can be used
13 for but for genocide, and I'll tell you what, this
14 little place right here is probably harder to get to
15 than Ft. Knox. But Ft. Knox can be cracked by a
16 squad of seals if they're given, you know, enough
17 money and time to plan. This is the modern Maginot
18 line. So this is how good they can handle their
19 nuclear-weapons-making potential right now. They're
20 not getting any better with it. They're just giving
21 you more lies. Thank you.

22 MR. BROWN: Janice Evans. Joe Martz will
23 be next.

24 DR. EVANS: Hello. My name is Janice
25 Evans. I appreciate the opportunity to speak with

1 you all. I'm here as a member of Agua es Vida
2 Action Team, or Water is Life Action Team, a citizen
3 group formed with the intent to advocate for keeping
4 our drinking water safe, especially as we prepare to
5 drink treated river water from the Rio Grande. I am
6 also a practicing physician in Albuquerque since
7 1986, and I'm here to speak because I believe that
8 one of the best medicines is preventing problems
9 before they occur.

10 New Mexico is one of six sites around the
11 country that has been identified as being at risk
12 for radioactive contamination of our water supply
13 due to previous radioactive waste disposal at DOE
14 nuclear weapons sites and the leaching that can
15 occur. This work has been described by Dr. Arjun
16 Makhijani at the web site www.ieer.org.

17 Dr. Makhijani is a Berkeley-trained engineer
18 specializing in plasma physics as applied to nuclear
19 fission, I believe, and works at the Institute for
20 Energy and Environmental Research. His article,
21 "Bad to the Bone," is very informative on this
22 matter.

23 Also other local environmental studies
24 have shown that we have radionuclides attached to
25 the sediment in the Cochiti Reservoir area as well

1 as radionuclides in the areas surrounding the
2 laboratories, our national laboratories, and some of
3 the streams there and also other water samples
4 collected from them. So Agua es Vida is very
5 concerned with preventing the long-term potential
6 health consequences of chronic exposure to our
7 citizens with radioactive drinking water
8 contaminated with low-level radioactivity. So we
9 are working with our local water utility authority
10 to advocate for sensitive enough detection of these
11 radionuclides in our water and actually would hope
12 that the national laboratories could collaborate in
13 this type of an effort.

14 We are also advocating to lower the
15 maximum contaminant level allowed from 15 picocuries
16 per liter to .15 as advocated by Dr. Arjun
17 Makhijani. The reason for this is that the evolving
18 science has shown that the old standards which were
19 developed from testing of atomic bomb fallout in the
20 1950s would actually expose us to 100 times more
21 radioactivity than was originally intended. We know
22 this because we now know that plutonium actually
23 migrates preferentially to the surface of the bone,
24 concentrates there, and stays there for decades in a
25 human being, continually emitting alpha wave

1 radioactivity, thereby putting nearby organs at risk
2 for cancer, including bone cancer, and leukemia, as
3 well as other organ cancers.

4 MR. BROWN: About a minute left.

5 DR. EVANS: The other issue is that the
6 older research did not account for pregnant women
7 and children. It was based on a reference of a man
8 approximately age 35. In pregnant women and
9 children you have a very accelerated growth right
10 where the DNA of the cells is constantly being
11 exposed in order to copy new genes. This makes the
12 DNA more at risk for radioactive damage potentially
13 leading to birth defects, cancer, and other unknown
14 illnesses that we may encounter in the future.

15 So in conclusion, Agua es Vida believes
16 that DOE and the national laboratories can be
17 instrumental in cleaning up the waste in our
18 environment that has already leaked into it, and we
19 are working with our local water utility authority
20 to request this occurs. Given, however, the current
21 risk to our environment with plutonium and other
22 radionuclides, at this point, we do not find there
23 is enough evidence to assure us of safety for
24 increasing the plutonium activity in our beautiful
25 environment of New Mexico, and advocate for not

1 doing that in order to protect our environment and
2 our citizens. Thank you.

3 MR. BROWN: Janet Greenwald. And Chuck
4 Hasking will follow Janet.

5 MS. GREENWALD: Hi. I'm Janet Greenwald.
6 I work with Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive
7 Dumping, the Albuquerque Center for Peace and
8 Justice, Agua es Vida Action Team, and the Nukes
9 Next Door Committee of the Albuquerque Center for
10 Peace and Justice.

11 I'm going to speak a little bit about some
12 personal experiences that have occurred to me with
13 my family and friends and coworkers. My son and
14 daughter-in-law live directly downwind from
15 Los Alamos in Dixon, New Mexico. They have a
16 beautiful one-year-old baby girl. During my
17 daughter-in-law's pregnancy, however, even though on
18 both sides of the family we have twins and for three
19 generations have had no problems having twins, my
20 daughter-in-law lost one of her twins during her
21 pregnancy and that made her a single-risk pregnancy.
22 Later they found that there were defects in her
23 fallopian tube, which made her a double-risk
24 pregnancy. Right before my granddaughter was born,
25 my son and daughter-in-law were taken into a room

1 and made to look through a scrapbook of deformed
2 babies that had been born mostly in Espanola, and
3 they were asked to say whether they wanted to see
4 this deformed baby, which they were told they would
5 probably have, before it was taken away, or if they
6 did not want to see it. That was what they had to
7 answer to. As you can imagine, my daughter-in-law's
8 pregnancy was a horrible experience for all of us.

9 My heart has just gone out to all those
10 families that have had those deformed babies, and I
11 feel even though I have been working on nuclear
12 projects for most of my life, a new dedication
13 inside of myself to preventing more of those
14 deformed babies from being born.

15 You might know that out on the Navajo
16 reservation there was a spill of uranium tailings
17 into a stream that contaminated sheep and then
18 people. Before that time, the Navajo people did not
19 have a special needs division of their public
20 schools, and after that time, they did. I have seen
21 pictures of the special needs division, and there
22 are many, multiple birth deformities among those
23 children.

24 My coworker in CARD is a young woman who
25 comes from the community of Mountainview, which is

1 directly downgradient from Sandia National Labs. My
2 coworker, who is 22 -- her grandmother worked at
3 Sandia National Labs. Her grandmother passed away
4 from a malignant brain tumor, and then her mother
5 passed away from leukemia while she was still a
6 child. She experiences epileptic seizures while
7 she's sleeping, and has done so since she was a
8 child. No one knows whether this is connected to
9 Sandia. However, it's plain to me that this
10 community downgradient from Sandia cannot stand any
11 more environmental stressors. And more nuclear
12 bombs is a stressor. We'll be seeing more
13 contaminated water, we'll be seeing more
14 radionuclides and more chemicals in our air.

15 I have a friend that lives at Acoma
16 Pueblo. Her mother was a uranium miner and miller,
17 and she died when my friend's children were still
18 young. And then a couple of years ago, her husband,
19 who worked at Sandia National Labs, died. He died
20 of two forms of cancer which are on the list of
21 cancers that can be caused by radiation, and that is
22 lymphoma and pancreatic cancer.

23 MR. BROWN: You have about a minute left,
24 please.

25 MS. GREENWALD: I have been trying to help

1 her get some compensation for herself and her two
2 sons. And what they tell her is that -- her husband
3 had a Q clearance, and they tell her that they
4 believe there's only a 54 percentage chance that he
5 could have gotten his cancers from his work. But
6 yet because he had a Q clearance, they will not tell
7 her where he worked, so therefore, she cannot bring
8 an independent expert in to help her with this
9 compensation procedure.

10 And she's not the only one. She's not the
11 only one. We don't need more bombs here. We need a
12 lot of help. We're already very stressed. A lot of
13 people are sick and dying from previous bomb-making.
14 Please reverse this plan for the sake of people here
15 living in New Mexico. Thank you.

16 MR. BROWN: Chuck Hasking.

17 MR. HASKING: My name is Chuck Hasking,
18 and I would contend that this country has a disease.
19 It's called empire. And I think we need a new EIS.
20 We need an empire impact statement. Because empire
21 is not good for the people in the empire, and it's
22 even worse for the people outside of the empire.
23 185 years ago, the fifth president of this country
24 declared the imperial plans of this country through
25 the Monroe Doctrine. It was at first limited only

1 to our hemisphere.

2 I heard on the news yesterday that
3 yesterday was the anniversary of 25 years after the
4 Monroe Doctrine when we wrested half of Mexico away
5 from that country and made enemies there. Fifty
6 years after that, the military man rode up San Juan
7 Hill and started to build US empire through land
8 acquisition. TR later rode into the White House on
9 a wave of support. The problem is that, you know,
10 he was not an anomaly. He represented the wishes of
11 the American people, and his spirit continued to
12 live on through the 20th century, as we intervened
13 dozens of times throughout our hemisphere here.
14 When popular uprisings occurred under Sandino in
15 Nicaragua, we sent in the Marines to quell that.

16 We emerged from World War II as the only
17 country in history willing to use nuclear weapons on
18 unarmed civilians and we wonder why the rest of the
19 world is not willing to trust us as the guarantor of
20 nuclear nonproliferation, all the while as we
21 continue to increase our nuclear weapons stockpile,
22 ignoring the treaties that we have signed and
23 treating them as toilet paper, essentially.

24 In the 1950s we continued our pattern. We
25 pulled off a coup in Guatemala in 1954 overthrowing

1 the Arbenz government. The year before we overthrew
2 the government in Iran installing the shah, who made
3 us a lot of enemies in that country. And we wonder
4 today why we're at odds with Iran; continuing on
5 through the 1980s with President Reagan harassing
6 the Nicaraguan people with the contras, and on into
7 the 1990s with President Clinton passing economic
8 strangleholds, breaking all the trade rules in favor
9 of the richest country in the world, so we amass
10 wealth from every country around the planet and we
11 wonder why people hate us.

12 MR. BROWN: You have got a minute left
13 here.

14 MR. HASKING: It was exactly six and a
15 half years ago today that a dozen angry Saudi young
16 men from a dictatorial regime that we had good
17 relations with in the Middle East turned our weapons
18 of high-tech transport into weapons of mass
19 destruction. And you know, we have to assess what
20 are the empire impact statements? If we continue to
21 want to amass all the world's wealth for ourselves,
22 and live at a level that's totally unsustainable,
23 both environmentally and socially, around the world,
24 then we had better darn well have the strongest
25 military on the planet, because that's really the

1 only purpose for it, is to protect our privileged
2 way of life. I would contend that peace through
3 superior fire power is a dead-end road. The only
4 way to lasting peace is through global sharing.
5 Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: Our next speaker is George
7 Lambert, and he will be followed by Dr. Daniel
8 Kerlinsky.

9 MR. LAMBERT: Hello. My name is George
10 Lambert, and I wanted to address my testimony by
11 saying that I have been in a lot of antinuke efforts
12 for around 25 years, and I haven't been too active
13 lately, and I have read in the Sunday paper that
14 there was going to be a hearing today and I decided
15 to show up. I talked to Don Hancock a little
16 earlier and I want to reiterate my statement I said
17 during the WIPP hearings, which is that the DOE's
18 track record is -- well, a little bit more than just
19 speckled. I would say an analogy would be you
20 design a car without brakes, and then you put piles
21 of dirt on the end of each road to stop the car.

22 So in saying that, also, you know, we're
23 not dealing -- basically what I'm trying to say is
24 that we're not dealing with the real problem, the
25 concern of the community, which is I'm so glad to

1 see people here that have concerns with the water,
2 that have concerns with the environment, the air. I
3 came here and I didn't go to school. I actually
4 blew off school to come here and I learned a lot.
5 But I'm so glad that I came up, and my testimony
6 today is that we don't need any more nuclear waste.
7 We need to try to -- we need to impose our beautiful
8 brilliant scientists, God bless them, you know -- I
9 think you guys are doing a great job, and I know
10 that you have every intention of protecting the
11 community and, of course, your jobs.

12 But my interests for my children and
13 grandchildren would be to create a Manhattan
14 Project, which I have heard earlier today and I have
15 heard back in -- you know, 20 years ago, a new
16 project, scientists, come on, you guys are
17 brilliant. Figure out a way to neutralize this
18 stuff. Figure out a viable way, if you're going to
19 do nukes, to make less waste. All right?

20 Now, does anybody here not know that when
21 you enrich uranium, you create a vast amount of
22 toxic waste? Well, let's just say if we take one of
23 these chairs and it's enriched uranium and the whole
24 rest of the chairs in the room are the uranium waste
25 that we have to deal with, which is more toxic after

1 it's processed into enriched uranium, then we go and
2 enrich that to make -- guess what -- plutonium for
3 triggers, things like this, and cause at least that
4 much waste again, which is way more toxic --

5 MR. BROWN: One minute remaining.

6 MR. LAMBERT: Wow. I thought I didn't
7 have anything to say. Anyway, my name is George
8 Lambert. I'm a worker in this community, and I have
9 children and grandchildren, and I wish everything to
10 be safe, and I want you guys to figure out how to
11 neutralize the stuff. That is the nuclear waste.
12 Thank you.

13 MR. BROWN: Louis Nicholas will follow
14 Dr. Kerlinsky.

15 DR. KERLINSKY: Thank you for the
16 opportunity to comment on the SPEIS for the complex
17 transformation. My name is Dr. Dan Kerlinsky, and
18 I'm speaking on behalf of New Mexico Physicians for
19 Social Responsibility tonight. In 1994 when I
20 served on the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board
21 Task Force, an alternative futures for the national
22 labs, the stockpile stewardship program was just
23 beginning. In the laboratory, directors were still
24 intent on maintaining high-energy theoretical
25 physics programs with new multibillion dollar

1 facilities such as NIF, the National Ignition
2 Facility, at Lawrence Livermore National Labs. The
3 Galvin Task Force recommended phasing out direct
4 nuclear weapons work at Lawrence Livermore National
5 Lab, recommended that the Department of Energy take
6 on its mission in the broader field of energy as
7 needed for a national policy on energy, that would
8 include the global need for sustainable development.

9 Fourteen years later, we stand at another
10 turning point in the road. Will the federal
11 government permit the construction of a vast new
12 weapons production complex with environmental
13 impacts deceptively underestimated? Pit production
14 rates of 50 per year, 125 per year, or 200 pits per
15 year cast from recycled plutonium pit alloys should
16 not be used as the basis for this environmental
17 impact statement.

18 The modern pit facility proposal for
19 308,000 square feet of plutonium pit processing at
20 Los Alamos is not a 50-to-200-pit-per-year proposal.
21 A facility this large with robotic automation could
22 produce thousands of pits per year. With a 50-year
23 facility lifetime, the PEIS should be scoped for
24 50,000 to 100,000 nuclear warheads. There is a vast
25 difference between reshaping metal bowls and moving

1 a ton a month of plutonium oxides, metals and alloys
2 through a production run.

3 Deception of the public is just not
4 acceptable. In chapter 3, page 37, that's
5 3.4.1.6.2, the draft PEIS makes it clear that only
6 9,000 square feet would be needed for pit production
7 if this function was added to the proposed new
8 chemistry and metallurgy research replacement
9 facility. This modest amount of floor space is a
10 more honest estimate. 9,000, not 308,000. Most of
11 the casting, welding, finishing and polishing of
12 pits happens in a single glove box on a working area
13 the size of a lab bench.

14 New Mexicans can think about the process
15 as similar to making and finishing a clay pot or a
16 bronze bowl. How much time does that take? How
17 many tons of new plutonium processing is required if
18 we are simply recycling the pits of 20,000 warheads
19 to maintain 1700 operationally deployed strategic
20 weapons? This consolidated plutonium center, the
21 CMRR, and the NPF are preparing for a much larger
22 mission under the cover of section 3.1.1.1 of the
23 National Defense Authorization Act where exploration
24 of "a reliable replacement warhead" was authorized
25 by Congress.

1 In 1994 the Galvin Task Force reminded the
2 National Security Committee that, quote, a "wooden
3 bomb" had been proposed in the 1950s. The notion of
4 a reliable replacement warhead is a similar Trojan
5 horse. Behind the false front of reliability will
6 come a new generation of cruise missiles and bombs.
7 We've been down this road before. The lab directors
8 lied repeatedly to the public and the Congress,
9 saying we could not maintain the safety and
10 reliability of nuclear weapons without full-scale
11 underground nuclear explosions. The Department of
12 Energy stood by in silence while the self-serving
13 myth was propagated --

14 MR. BROWN: If you can wrap up, please.

15 DR. KERLINSKY: -- within the more limited
16 confines of the SPEIS. It is clear that Los Alamos
17 cannot handle the true amount of toxic waste that
18 would come from these proposals. To evaluate the
19 alternatives adequately, the maximum rates of
20 plutonium processing waste must be estimated based
21 on the maximum use of floor space advancing
22 robotics, 50-year projections of maximum output, and
23 the use not only of recycled plutonium metal, but
24 also the throughput of plutonium oxides in the
25 production of various metal alloys where the

1 greatest volume of pit-related toxic waste would be.

2 As written, the SPEIS is built on a hoax
3 of minimal production of pits from recycled metal
4 while the massive production capacity of this
5 complex is disguised. Give us accurate numbers on
6 the maximal output and the maximal waste or reduce
7 the facilities down to the honest size required to
8 make replacement pits for current weapons.

9 MR. BROWN: Louis Nicholas. And Claudia
10 Fluegge will be next.

11 MR. NICHOLAS: Hi. My name is Lou
12 Nicholas. I oppose any further nuclear weapons
13 production based on moral grounds, on the hypocrisy
14 of our country in relation to other countries who
15 are aspiring to be nuclear powers, and also
16 environmental concerns. We have the miserable track
17 record of the federal government in its past nuclear
18 weapons production, and they refuse to clean up
19 their previous mess, and how can we trust them now?

20 So I oppose on environmental grounds, as
21 well, and I work -- I came to Albuquerque in 1983 in
22 the Air Force. I worked at the Air Force Weapons
23 Lab in weapons testing, actually was involved with
24 the tests on aircraft shelter with depleted uranium,
25 and I decided to leave the Air Force on moral

1 grounds. So I would urge people in weapons
2 production to join me. That's all I have.

3 MR. BROWN: Nell Burrus will follow
4 Claudia.

5 MS. FLUEGGE: My name is Claudia Fluegge,
6 and I'm here mainly because I want our children to
7 have a future. My children are sitting both right
8 there with me. I'm worried about the waste that
9 we're going to be producing with more of these
10 nuclear weapons. I think we already don't know what
11 to do with the waste. The nuclear weapons that are
12 here -- I used to live in Germany and I always think
13 it's really ironic, because I remember opposing the
14 same nuclear weapons over there, and now for some
15 peculiar reason, I think I tend to follow them. So
16 it's scary. And I just hate the thought of more
17 stuff being produced.

18 I'm very worried about other people in the
19 world who are being threatened with these nuclear
20 weapons, and I just hate to think what could happen
21 if we did put them to use, and we already know, you
22 know, how horrific that was. Anybody in their right
23 mind wouldn't want to put them to use. So why waste
24 our time, waste our money polluting and
25 contaminating everything, if we could stop right

1 away, and not do any more?

2 So I really urge the people who are
3 responsible to stop this project and this idea. I
4 liked the idea earlier to try and neutralize the
5 stuff. I don't know how that's possible, though.
6 So in the meantime, I think we really need to put
7 our money to use in a healthier way, and not
8 contaminate the world anymore. Yeah. That's pretty
9 much it. Thank you. Bye.

10 MR. BROWN: Nell Burrus is next, and
11 Jeffrey Rich will follow her.

12 MS. BURRUS: Hi. My name is Nell Burrus.
13 I work for Albuquerque Public Schools. I'm the
14 Albuquerque coordinator for Amnesty International,
15 which is affiliated with the Peace and Justice
16 Center, but really I'm just here representing
17 myself. I was born and raised in Oak Ridge
18 Tennessee, where Y12 and K25 are located. My father
19 was a nuclear physicist. My stepfather is a health
20 physicist. I grew up in a quite privileged middle
21 class environment because of the nuclear weapons
22 industry in my community.

23 You know, as I have sat here tonight
24 listening to the testimony, and I think about the
25 people in the room that work for the labs or some

1 weapons-related jobs, you know, I think we just need
2 to remember that everybody here is a person and I
3 personally benefited from the military weapons
4 complex. It paid for my college education. I pay
5 federal taxes. My hands aren't clean either. I
6 wish I could say that I didn't pay federal taxes and
7 support the military weapons complex. But you know,
8 behind the PowerPoint presentations, behind the
9 suits, behind the stature and education, there's
10 really people there, and I'm sure that they think
11 about their families and their personal security.
12 They probably disagree with me on what makes a safe
13 country. I respect that opinion. I think they
14 believe that they are doing the best thing not only
15 for their own personal comfort but for the country
16 and for their community.

17 I think we need to find a way of talking
18 to each other, because I also found myself clapping
19 just a little tiny bit for the research scientist
20 from Los Alamos who said if you want us to change
21 our mission, please contact Udall and come. Let
22 them know that we want to change the mission also.
23 And I think there's people inside of Los Alamos and
24 Sandia who actually agree with us, and maybe
25 publicly they're not allowed to express that

1 opinion.

2 The image that came to mind was the Berlin
3 Wall. Nobody knocked that wall down. It just came
4 down. You know, I'm not a religious person, but I
5 just ask everybody to, you know, send positive
6 energy to the people who are working in that field.
7 Please give them the courage and the -- they need
8 the courage to follow their moral convictions, and
9 sometimes it's just thinking outside the box.
10 Sometimes it's just saying, okay, well, you know,
11 this is the choice I have made up until now and it
12 made sense to me, I think I'm doing the right thing.
13 There may be other options I didn't even consider
14 that would allow me to feel safe in my own country
15 and would allow me to provide for my family. I just
16 hope that we can find a way to have jobs for New
17 Mexicans that are healthy, sustainable and good for
18 the whole planet. Thank you.

19 MR. BROWN: Jeffrey Rich.

20 MR. RICH: Thank you for having this open
21 session. My name is Jeffrey Rich. Just a little
22 short story and how this relates to the complex is
23 that my father came to New Mexico in 1970 with me,
24 to work for the government at the Department of
25 Defense, which is now Department of Energy. He

1 worked for the Defense Nuclear Agency, now the
2 Special Weapons Project. And what he did at the
3 Wright-Patterson Air Force Base was help with
4 testing of the motors for the cruise missiles
5 because he's an engineer and he knows about that
6 stuff.

7 Well, later in his career he worked at
8 Mercury Nevada, which was a secret area, secure area
9 in Nevada where they test underground bombs, dig
10 tunnels like WIPP and blow up bombs, see how it
11 relates to radios and things like that. And he did
12 that for a living. He did that to fight the Soviet
13 Union, which has some validity to it. There's
14 always an enemy to fight, and the Soviets were quite
15 evil at that time. They had took over most of
16 Europe, most of the world, and I understand his
17 reasoning.

18 How does this relate to the bomb, though?
19 When he was working with these weapons, he supported
20 the project. In other words, he supported his job.
21 When he retired, he told me that there was a lot of
22 waste of money, especially after the first President
23 Bush made the below-ground testing not available for
24 us to test.

25 Well, in our talks, we talked about what

1 General Eisenhower said. He was the supreme
2 military commander during World War II, then became
3 our president, and he talked about the military
4 industrial complex and how it basically will sap our
5 tax dollars and threaten our liberty. And so we had
6 a talk about that. This project here is just a
7 small part of the military industrial complex, a
8 very small part. But it is a part that we don't
9 really need.

10 If the U.S. Government proceeds with this,
11 I just ask that you do two things: That you please
12 offshore the production of nuclear weapons to non-US
13 companies, except to Halliburton, which is part of
14 Dubai now, so we don't have to mess with it.

15 The second is, please raise our taxes to
16 fully pay for this before producing it, and go
17 through Congress, so that my future grandchildren
18 will not pay for it. In other words, please don't
19 borrow money for this project. All teasing aside,
20 this project is a waste of money. It's just another
21 way taxpayers are supporting the war machine. So I
22 say no to this project. Thank you very much.

23 MR. BROWN: That concludes the list of
24 folks who signed up ahead of time to make
25 statements. Let me ask if there's anybody in the

1 audience who has not spoken yet who would like to
2 add a comment at this point. If so, raise your
3 hand. I'll be glad to call on you. Okay. I guess
4 in the absence of anybody who hasn't spoken
5 beforehand, if you want to add a few things.

6 MR. ERDMAN: I actually beg your
7 indulgence. My wife had to leave before she was
8 able to speak, and she left just a few words that
9 she wanted --

10 MR. BROWN: If you can give her name to
11 the court reporter.

12 MR. ERDMAN: Actually I think she was
13 called on and there was confusion. Anne Sensenig.
14 She writes, "I work at an elementary school here in
15 Albuquerque. And we're always telling our students
16 to use words, not fists, to work out differences.
17 And there are consequences for those who choose
18 physical force rather than communication. Yet I
19 wonder why we bother teaching them this? The adult
20 world so obviously runs by the maxim 'Might makes
21 right.' How can we explain this difference? And
22 how can we expect them to do better than the adults
23 around them in their own country?

24 "Meanwhile each year it's getting harder
25 for our public schools. Fewer and fewer resources

1 mean more and more pressure on school employees and
2 on students. Instead of choosing to use our
3 national resources to improve education and the
4 future of our children and our nation, our resources
5 are sucked up by our gluttonous military budget.
6 This is not the future I hope for our country and
7 our world. Surely as world leaders the US should be
8 a shining and positive example to the world.

9 "When I was in high school, I saw a
10 documentary about the nuclear bombs the US dropped
11 on Japan, with actual footage of bomb victims.
12 Searing images like those are difficult to forget.

13 "So for the record, I'm opposed to my very
14 core to having any nuclear production in the state
15 of New Mexico or anywhere in the world, for that
16 matter. As for these hearings, I feel angry and
17 insulted by the fact that they are happening all
18 over again. Only last year I traveled to Los Alamos
19 to express my opposition to continued plutonium pit
20 production. During the last set of hearings, 33,000
21 comments were gathered, 90 percent of which opposed
22 continued production or requested further analysis.
23 What happened to those voices? To me, it appears
24 that they were disregarded and now a new set of
25 token opportunities to voice our opinions is being

1 provided, perhaps with the hopes that this time
2 public opinion will be what the DOE wants it to be.

3 "Finally, I would like to express my
4 disappointment in our New Mexico representatives.
5 Senator Domenici and Representatives Wilson and
6 Pearce are supportive of nuclear development, while
7 Senator Bingaman and Representative Udall, who might
8 present themselves as moderates, are opposed to
9 continuing nuclear development, not only have been
10 silent in the face of proposals in Congress, but in
11 Representative Udall's case have actually worked to
12 restore funding to LANL for nuclear production.

13 "You have heard it said that silence
14 implies consent. I want to make it clear by my
15 voice here tonight that I do not consent to any
16 nuclear weapon production in this fair but tainted
17 state of New Mexico. Thank you."

18 MR. BROWN: Is there anyone else who would
19 like to add comments at this time? Yes.

20 MR. McCOY: Dave McCoy, Citizen Action. I
21 want to add a comment by way of a question, and you
22 have to answer this question. As part of your
23 environmental impact statement, you made the
24 statement that it's necessary to go forward with the
25 design and the production and the study and this

1 kind of thing under the Atomic Energy Act and the
2 nuclear posture of the -- I always thought the
3 nuclear posture review was what I learned in third
4 grade when I had to crawl under the table in a fetal
5 position, you know.

6 But anyhow, you have not provided the
7 specific section of either of those two documents
8 that says you are compelled to go forward with this
9 development, and you have rejected the no-production
10 alternative, which is 90 percent of what the people
11 want. I think I coined that term, too. I think I
12 was the first one to use that. But you haven't
13 justified your rejection of the no-production
14 alternative on the basis of anything that's in the
15 law in your Atomic Energy Act or in your nuclear
16 posture review. So you have to cite to me where it
17 says you have to do this and that the no-production
18 alternative has to be rejected on the basis of
19 what's in that act or the posture review. Okay,
20 thanks.

21 MR. BROWN: Thanks. Anyone else for a
22 comment? Okay. We are scheduled to remain in
23 session through 10:00, so we will recess at this
24 point. If anybody decides they'd like to add
25 something, please see me. DOE will remain available

1 for comment, and the court reporter will remain
2 available, as well. Again, thank you all for your
3 attendance here. Thanks for your comments, and we
4 will recess.

5 (The hearing recessed at 10:00 p.m.)

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO

SS

2 COUNTY OF BERNALILLO

3

4 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

5 I, MARY ABERNATHY SEAL, New Mexico

6 Certified Shorthand Reporter, DO HEREBY CERTIFY that

7 I did report in stenographic shorthand the

8 proceedings set forth herein, and the foregoing is a

9 true and correct transcription of proceedings.

10 I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither

11 employed by nor related to any of the parties or

12 attorneys in this case, and that I have no interest

13 whatsoever in the final disposition of this case in

14 any court.

15

16 _____
Mary Abernathy Seal

Certified Court Reporter #69

17 License expires: 12/31/08

18

(6042A) MAS

19 Date taken: March 11, 2008

Proofread by: LR

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

RECEIPT

JOB NUMBER: 6042A MAS March 11, 2008

WITNESS NAME: TetraTech public comment hearing

CASE CAPTION:

ATTORNEY: Jackie Boltz

DOCUMENT: Transcript / Exhibits / Disks / Other _____

DATE DELIVERED: _____ DEL'D BY: _____

REC'D BY: _____ TIME: _____

ATTORNEY: ATTY2

DOCUMENT: Transcript / Exhibits / Disks / Other _____

DATE DELIVERED: _____ DEL'D BY: _____

REC'D BY: _____ TIME: _____

ATTORNEY: ATTY3

DOCUMENT: Transcript / Exhibits / Disks / Other _____

DATE DELIVERED: _____ DEL'D BY: _____

REC'D BY: _____ TIME: _____

ATTORNEY: ATTY4

DOCUMENT: Transcript / Exhibits / Disks / Other _____

DATE DELIVERED: _____ DEL'D BY: _____

REC'D BY: _____ TIME: _____