

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

11:00 a.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

(6041A) MAS

1 MR. BROWN: If folks will take their
2 seats, we'll get started on this afternoon's
3 meeting. There are a lot of folks still standing in
4 the back. We've got plenty of seats if you want to
5 sit down. And thanks.

6 Good afternoon, and welcome to this public
7 hearing on the National Nuclear Security
8 Administration Supplemental Programmatic
9 Environmental Impact Statement, or Supplemental
10 PEIS, for the transformation of the nation's nuclear
11 weapons complex. I hope you have had an opportunity
12 to browse through the displays and talk to the staff
13 during the just-completed open house.

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

22 At the registration table you should have
23 received a participant packet which contains
24 information on the transformation complex. If not,
25 please raise your hand and staff can bring you a

1 copy.

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 welcome video by Robert Smolen,
7 deputy administrator for defense programs. It will
8 be followed by a 20-minute presentation by Mr. Ted
9 Wyka, the supplemental PEIS document manager.

10 Mr. Wyka will discuss the complex transformation
11 project and the contents of the supplemental PEIS.

12 The formal comments segment will begin
13 immediately after Mr. Wyka's presentation. During
14 the formal comments segment, members of the public
15 will provide their views on the supplemental PEIS.
16 The court reporter will transcribe a verbatim record
17 of your comments. Ted Wyka will be present to hear
18 your comments, but will not be responding to
19 questions or comments.

20 If you wish to make a comment and have not
21 yet signed up to do so, you may add your name to the
22 list at the registration desk out front. We now
23 continue the information segment with a video by
24 Mr. Robert Smolen, Deputy Administrator for Defense
25 Programs of the Department of Energy.

1 (Video presentation.)

2 (Oral presentation by Mr. Wyka.)

3 MR. BROWN: It's now time to receive your
4 formal comments on the proposed supplemental PEIS.
5 This is your opportunity to give DOE your views on
6 the draft documents. The court reporter is ready to
7 take down your statement.

8 Let me review a few ground rules for the
9 formal comments. Please step up to the microphone
10 over there when your name is called, introduce
11 yourself, providing an organizational affiliation
12 where appropriate. If you have a written version of
13 your statement, please provide a copy to the court
14 reporter after you have completed your remarks,
15 seated right in front of that podium. I will call
16 two names at a time. The first is the speaker, the
17 second is the person to follow. In view of the
18 number of people who've indicated an interest in
19 speaking this afternoon, please confine your remarks
20 to five minutes. That will take us right to the end
21 of the scheduled time for this meeting. I will let
22 you know when you have a minute left.

23 Ted Wyka will be serving as the hearing
24 officer for the Department of Energy during this
25 formal comments period. Our first speaker is Terry

1 Wallace, and he will be followed by Doug Beason.

2 MR. WALLACE: Good afternoon. My name is
3 Terry Wallace. I am the principal associate
4 director for science technology and engineering at
5 Los Alamos National Laboratory, and I appreciate the
6 opportunity to make some brief remarks today. Let
7 me begin by stating both my professional and
8 personal opinion, based on many years of scientific
9 research in which I have worked on national security
10 science and worked on solving complex problems for
11 protecting our nation, and that is that the
12 preferred alternative outlined in the department's
13 complex transformation supplemental PEIS is the best
14 choice for our nation and our national security
15 interest, and I strongly encourage the department to
16 adopt the preferred alternative in the final record
17 of decision.

18 Let me briefly explain why I believe the
19 preferred alternative should be adopted. First, the
20 department proposed the centers of excellence
21 approach to modernizing the US weapons complex.
22 This makes the most efficient, effective use of
23 existing national resources, while also ensuring the
24 evolution necessary to meet national security needs
25 in the 21st century and beyond. For decades, every

1 US president and Congress has recognized and
2 supported the need for an effective nuclear
3 deterrent, and our military leaders have agreed, as
4 well. I would refer to remarks made just last week
5 by the head of the US Military Strategic Command,
6 Air Force General Kevin Chilton, who said very
7 clearly and simply that while nuclear disarmament is
8 a very desirable goal, the US will need to maintain
9 an effective supply of nuclear weapons to act as a
10 deterrent to attacks from other nations for the
11 remainder of the 21st century.

12 Given the recognition and the reality,
13 however harsh, we are obligated to maintain and
14 continually modernize through scientific
15 technological production, infrastructure that
16 supports our national deterrent, while also working
17 towards having the minimum number of weapons
18 necessary to maintain a safe and effective
19 deterrent. This is precisely what the department
20 has laid out in the supplemental PEIS, in a plan to
21 meet our national needs and evolve to be even
22 smaller as the stockpile needs change.

23 Within the overall weapons complex,
24 Los Alamos has been designated as the preferred
25 alternative or the center of excellence for a number

1 of issues focusing on scientific R&D. These include
2 plutonium research development and manufacturing,
3 weapons design and engineering, and finally
4 supercomputing. Now, there's no question in my mind
5 that Los Alamos' extensive expertise in handling of
6 nuclear materials and nonnuclear materials
7 associated with this are a logical future source or
8 center, in particular, that look at very limited
9 plutonium manufacturing and R&D.

10 There are two key critical factors to the
11 preferred alternative I'd like to highlight. First
12 is that the preferred alternative will replace
13 several critical facilities at Los Alamos that are
14 outdated and are badly in need of replacement. The
15 replacement facilities will be smaller, they'll be
16 more modern, they'll use 21st century security
17 technology, and consolidate functions that today are
18 performed at many locations across the country.
19 Modernizing Los Alamos National Laboratory will
20 reduce the overall size of the footprint by
21 approximately 20 percent and the nuclear operations
22 footprint by over 50 percent. This will result in
23 cost savings through greater work force efficiency,
24 but as importantly, it will make up for a much more
25 secure and safe complex.

1 The second of these pillars is the
2 rationale behind science and our deterrent. Since
3 1992, we have not tested underground, and we've
4 relied on science campaigns and science expertise to
5 certify our nuclear weapons. We'll continue to do
6 this far into the future under the present plan.

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

8 MR. WALLACE: Thank you. Let me
9 highlight what the scientific capabilities are.
10 These capabilities are quite broad. As an example,
11 Los Alamos recently published a number of papers
12 about the structure and the modes of our sun. And
13 this turns out to be most important for the biggest
14 unknown in climate models. These are the same
15 people that are working on and providing science
16 capability for maintaining our stockpile. When we
17 look at plutonium, fundamental discoveries in the
18 last two years on the nature of superconductivity
19 come from looking at the very complex electron cloud
20 associated with that element.

21 Finally, Los Alamos is stepping out and
22 producing the largest of the world's fastest
23 supercomputer, Roadrunner. This computer will be
24 exercised to develop new models in terms of climate
25 and ocean circulation.

1 Again, the science capability is one of
2 the main deterrents. Los Alamos science remains an
3 important part of the PEIS. In closing, I strongly
4 encourage the department to adopt the preferred
5 alternative in the final record of decision, and I
6 thank you for your time.

7 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Doug Beason is
8 next. And Marlin Good will follow Doug.

9 MR. BEASON: Thank you. I appreciate the
10 opportunity to speak. I am Doug Beason. I'm the
11 associate director at Los Alamos for threat
12 production, and what this means is that I represent
13 the other type or the other side of the laboratory,
14 the defensive side, the one charged with preventing
15 terrorism, the one preventing the spread of weapons
16 of mass destruction, and also the one that tries to
17 eliminate the global threat to weapons of mass
18 destruction.

19 In my professional and my personal view, I
20 strongly support the preferred alternative, and I
21 urge that it be reflected in the record of decision.
22 My reason for this is that, first and foremost, I
23 cannot do my mission of trying to eliminate the
24 threat of weapons of mass destruction without having
25 the weapons program present at Los Alamos. What I

1 mean by this is that the people, the equipment, the
2 facilities, the computers, everything there I use in
3 my job. I use this in five mission elements. The
4 first mission element of trying to anticipate the
5 threat of weapons of mass destruction, where the
6 terrorists are. I use the very same people that we
7 use to ensure the safety and reliability of the
8 nuclear weapons stockpile.

9 The second element, trying to understand
10 the threat, we do this with computer programs, we do
11 this with programs that are developed for the
12 weapons program, and we apply that to my threat
13 reduction programs.

14 The third element, trying to detect the
15 threat. We do this with sensors, and again we do
16 this with sensors developed in the weapons program.

17 The fourth element, trying to deter. And
18 then the final element, trying to respond to the
19 threat. All these are wrapped up again in my threat
20 reduction programs, and they all come from
21 capabilities that reside in the nuclear weapons
22 program.

23 And again, two mission elements which I
24 would like to talk about, or at least to highlight:
25 The IAEA training that we do at Los Alamos. These

1 are the international inspectors that try to go
2 around and detect if there are any illicit uses of
3 special nuclear material. We do all of that
4 training at Los Alamos. But again, we do those in
5 facilities that were built for and are used for the
6 nuclear weapons program.

7 The second, the MOX, or the metallic oxide
8 program. This is a program that was started at
9 Los Alamos and it has resulted in the disablement
10 and the downturn of actually over 20,000 nuclear
11 weapons, both Russian and our weapons, and one could
12 even view this as the greatest disarmament effort in
13 the history of the world. All the capability for
14 this effort has come from Los Alamos and has come
15 from capability that has been provided by the
16 nuclear weapons program.

17 So in conclusion, what I'm saying is that
18 my program, which is about a third of the total
19 Los Alamos budget, entirely depends upon the weapons
20 program, and I cannot do my job of ensuring the
21 threat reduction mission and elimination of global
22 elimination of weapons of mass destruction if I
23 didn't have the weapons program to rely on. So in
24 conclusion, again, I would like to completely
25 support the preferred alternative, and hope and urge

1 that that be reflected in the record of decision.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Marlin Good. And
4 Betty Smith will follow Marlin.

5 MR. GOOD: Thanks to the Department of
6 Energy and Mr. Wyka for allowing this time and
7 space. Thanks to the press for covering such an
8 important event. And thanks to the Raging Grannies
9 for the song and humor, which we so desperately need
10 in times like these.

11 I come today -- my name is Marlin Good --
12 as at least one representative from Albuquerque
13 Mennonite Church. Albuquerque Mennonite Church is
14 part of the National Mennonite Church, a historic
15 peace church much like the Society of Friends. We
16 have been called the quiet in the land, but we've
17 been so quiet that many people think of us as some
18 strange cult. Others think we ride around in
19 buggies, like the Amish. And with the price of gas,
20 more of us may be headed in that direction.

21 But many Mennonites can be quiet no more.
22 Our silence in the face of political and
23 environmental crises is immoral. I ask forgiveness
24 for our past inaction in the face of war and the
25 preparations for war. I ask for pardon because of

1 recent silence in the national dialogue concerning
2 the second Iraq war. And I ask forgiveness for past
3 acquiescence to fear, fear of what others may think,
4 and fear of losing privilege.

5 Some say this is a complex issue. But I
6 say it is only complex in the myriad of reasons to
7 say no to the production of nuclear weapons. It is
8 only complex because of the tortured logic and
9 continued justification for the building and planned
10 use of nuclear weapons. I could repeat the
11 economic, the environmental, the political, the
12 rational, and the national security reasons for the
13 elimination of nuclear weapons. I could reiterate
14 our international treaty obligations, but you know
15 these arguments and statistics already, or you'll
16 hear about them.

17 I do, though, want to share with you a
18 quote I came across a couple of weeks ago. I have
19 been intrigued -- well, no, really haunted -- by the
20 poignant thought, imagery, and relevancy. President
21 Eisenhower said in 1953, "After my experience, I
22 have come to hate war. War settles nothing." This
23 is clear, succinct, credible, and to the point. But
24 he continues. "Under the clouds of war, it is
25 humanity hanging on a cross of iron. Under the

1 clouds of war, dare we say under the specter of
2 mushroom clouds, we see the death of our humanness,
3 our very soul."

4 We can talk of terror and terrorists, we
5 can talk of the long war, of 100 years in Iraq. We
6 can talk of enemies of Islamofacism, whatever and
7 wherever that is. We can talk of good and evil. We
8 may justify war, even nuclear war, in political,
9 nationalistic, even religious terms, such as the
10 struggle with some preconceived and fabricated axis
11 of evil. But I say enough. Basta. No more. No
12 mas. Nuclear weapons are immoral, unjustifiable,
13 and a crime against humankind and nature.

14 What is at stake here today is a peaceful
15 future for our children. What is at risk is our
16 environment. What hangs in the balance is our
17 humanity. What will it be, my friends? Humanity
18 hanging on a cross of iron, or will it be you and me
19 listening to what Lincoln called the better angels
20 of our nature? Do we say yes to life and hope?
21 Will we say yes to a better tomorrow for our
22 children and our children's children? Yes or no?
23 Life or death? Which will we choose? Thanks for
24 listening.

25 MR. BROWN: Betty Smith, and Joan Brown

1 will follow Betty.

2 MS. SMITH: I'm so excited -- I almost
3 said good morning because I love to say good morning
4 better than good afternoon. Anyway, when I was a
5 senior in high school, I proposed our class motto,
6 quoting FDR. "The only thing we have to fear is
7 fear itself." It was adopted as our class motto,
8 and now you'll know how old I am, in 1949.

9 I am a retired science teacher and
10 elementary teacher. Part of my career -- or my main
11 career was teaching on the Navajo and Pueblo Indian
12 reservations. About five years ago, when President
13 Bush was here, we had a demonstration down at the
14 old REI building near the Old Town Hotel where he
15 was headquartered. There was a Navajo young man
16 there with the Tribal Environmental Department, and
17 so I do not make up this story. He told about the
18 tailings, the uranium mine tailings, that had
19 polluted the water around Crownpoint and Church
20 Rock. Church Rock is just east of Gallup. He told
21 about how the children there in the schools at
22 Crownpoint have learning disabilities which can be
23 traced back to the mine tailings pollution of the
24 water that they have to drink.

25 This should not be. This should not

1 happen in this United States of America. I am
2 opposed to any new pit production. I'm not just
3 opposed to expanded. I'm opposed to any new pit
4 production. We already have thousands of pits in
5 storage, in inventory. Why do we need more, unless
6 it's for what the gentleman before me was talking
7 about, what General Eisenhower said more than 50
8 years ago? Beware of the military industrial
9 complex. To me, this is what this is all about.

10 We have information that the Pentagon and
11 the president are not even in favor of this program.
12 It would require more uranium mining. Why do we
13 want more mining to pollute more waters? Why do we
14 want more pit production at Los Alamos to pollute
15 the Rio Grande, where we are supposed to be getting
16 our water supply in the very near future? They
17 don't even have a plan there for the pollution that
18 has already happened over these many years.

19 MR. BROWN: You have about a minute left
20 now.

21 MS. SMITH: All right. I don't understand
22 why this country believes it has the exclusive right
23 to nuclear weapons production. It is only going to
24 encourage other countries in the world to do the
25 same. I beg our congressional delegation to stop

1 the funding for this insane, this wild movement. It
2 should not happen. And the only way it will stop is
3 if we as citizens contact our delegation, Domenici,
4 who is so in favor of it; Bingaman, who does not
5 stand up to him; and Tom Udall, who wants it because
6 his district includes Los Alamos. Could that have
7 anything to do with his voting in favor of this
8 expansion?

9 MR. BROWN: If you can offer just one
10 summary statement.

11 MS. SMITH: I invite you to read "Brave
12 New World," which I was required to read in a
13 master's program many years ago. "Brave New World"
14 by Aldous Huxley. The first chapter is about after
15 a nuclear war in New Mexico. Thank you.

16 MR. BROWN: Thank you very much.

17 Joan Brown, and Bud Ryan will follow Joan.

18 MS. BROWN: Good afternoon. My name is
19 Joan Brown, and I'm a Franciscan sister, and I'm
20 with the Partnership for Earth Spirituality. Thank
21 you all for being here today. I think it's rather
22 interesting that this hearing is being held during
23 Lent, which really is a season looking at
24 transformation, and what transformation really
25 means. And I would put that question out to all of

1 us gathered. What we're looking at here -- is it
2 truly transformation?

3 Before I make some other comments, there
4 are some things I have become aware of since I have
5 been here that don't make sense to me, and seems
6 like it's sort of double-speak. One is the
7 presentation that we were all given here, it says
8 that -- well, first of all, with this sheet -- and
9 then we also picked up in the back information
10 sheets from Los Alamos. And one of the facts it
11 states is that LANL is not going to expand the
12 stockpile or add any more new weapons. And then
13 here this morning we were told that it is part of --
14 the purpose is to maintain a capability design,
15 develop and produce new or adapted warheads in the
16 event of a new military requirement. I don't quite
17 understand what the mission is here, the
18 double-speak.

19 There is another one, and it's stated that
20 there will be safe testing, there won't be any more
21 need for underground nuclear testing, which is not
22 being done, and yet here we are told sustained
23 capability to perform underground tests, if
24 required.

25 I don't work at this every day. In fact,

1 I took off work to be here today, so I'm not paid to
2 be here. But if I, who can read, find some
3 discrepancies, people that are working with this,
4 day in day out -- I'm just not clear what's going on
5 and what that mission might be.

6 In terms of transformation, I think that
7 if we really were looking at that, we need to
8 consider some things that have been coming out very
9 recently, like this national security and the threat
10 of climate change, which has many advisors who were
11 retired military leaders, stating that climate
12 change is one of, if not the greatest national
13 security and international security threat.

14 True transformation I believe would be for
15 life, would be looking at putting more money and
16 research into renewable energy, into solar, into
17 wind, into other ways of transporting ourselves
18 around, into helping people of other countries with
19 true technologies to address volatile conditions
20 that we're facing with climate change, such as a
21 scarcity of water, less food resources, and
22 depletion of soils that produce food.

23 Currently, I was trying to find out from
24 LANL how much money is put into some of those
25 things. It seemed to be like for energy, for the

1 environment, health care, that seem to be tied to
2 the 50 percent or more that's used for the military
3 capabilities at the lab. And it seems like it's
4 very small. They couldn't tell me how much that is.
5 Maybe in terms of energy it might be 10 percent, and
6 then that's tied to the nuclear. It seems like it
7 should be turned around. Perhaps we should be
8 spending at least 50 or 70 or 90 or 100 percent in
9 these areas that really affect life here in the
10 United States and national security, as well as in
11 other places, in health care, environment, energy,
12 and other technologies. That would be a true
13 transformation.

14 But I'm not sure that my comments about
15 transformation are really going to be heard that
16 well, so I'd like to just note, I would like for us
17 not to go ahead with this complex transformation,
18 which is not a transformation. But if that's not
19 accepted, I would like to state this. That it's
20 premature to begin this process, because the Bush
21 Administration's 2001 nuclear posture review is
22 cited as a policy driver for transformation of the
23 complex, and the Defense Authorization Act of 2008,
24 which became public in January, requires the
25 formation of a bipartisan commission appointed by

1 the Armed Services Committees that is required to
2 issue a report by December of 2008. The commission
3 is to recommend the number of nuclear weapons, et
4 cetera.

5 So these hearings seem a little bit
6 premature to me on that account. They're also
7 rather premature in the fact that a nuclear posture
8 review will be required in 2009. So are we wasting
9 our money by having hearing after hearing that
10 really does not, you know -- that will have other
11 hearings because we don't have all of the
12 information?

13 MR. BROWN: I am sorry. You have got just
14 a minute left.

15 MS. BROWN: Yes. Finally, I would like to
16 say that one of our distinguished speakers this
17 morning said that we need this so he could do his
18 mission. Well, I can't do my mission as a
19 Franciscan and as a human being with this kind of
20 money being spent on destruction and death when we
21 are facing climate change and other issues that
22 really are security threats. We as human beings
23 here cannot do our mission truly if this is where
24 we're putting our priorities and our money. What is
25 our mission as human beings at this point in

1 history, which requires grave and radical
2 transformation and decisions for that
3 transformation?

4 And I would like to end with Deuteronomy,
5 which is quoted this time of year, in Lent, and it
6 says, "I set before you life or death, blessing or
7 curse. Choose life, then, so that you and your
8 descendants may live." Thank you.

9 MR. BROWN: Bud Ryan is next, and then
10 Floy Barrett. Let me ask again, if you have a cell
11 phone, either turn it off or put it on quiet.
12 Thanks. Bud.

13 MR. RYAN: Hi. I'm Bud Ryan, with Pax
14 Christi New Mexico. Pax Christi is an international
15 Catholic peace group, and you know, I was amazed at
16 how calmly everybody here was talking about building
17 new nuclear weapons. Because what is the bottom
18 line for nuclear weapons? Death. This is nuclear
19 weapons. This is a boy right near the hypocenter in
20 Nagasaki. These are skeleton remains of people that
21 were buried in a mass grave in Hiroshima. And this
22 is a mother feeding her baby after the blast at
23 Hiroshima. That is what these people are actually
24 talking about so calmly. I'm just shocked at the
25 way they can calmly talk about that.

1 I'd like to read an excerpt from a speech
2 that John F. Kennedy gave at American University on
3 June 10, 1963. "I have therefore chosen this time
4 and place to discuss a topic on which ignorance too
5 often abounds, and the truth is too rarely
6 perceived. And that is the most topic on earth,
7 peace.

8 "What kind of peace do I mean, and what
9 kind of peace do we see? Not a Pax Americana,
10 enforced on the world by American weapons of war.
11 Not the peace of the grave or the security of the
12 slave. I am talking about genuine peace, the kind
13 of peace that makes life on earth worth living, and
14 the kind that enables men and nations to grow and to
15 hope and build a better life for their children.
16 Not merely peace for Americans, but peace for all
17 men and women. Not merely peace in our time, but
18 peace in all time. I speak of peace because of the
19 new face of war.

20 "Total war makes no sense in an age where
21 great powers can maintain large and relatively
22 invulnerable nuclear forces and refuse to surrender
23 without resort to those forces. It makes no sense
24 in an age when a single nuclear weapon contains
25 almost ten times the explosive force delivered by

1 all the allied air forces in the second world war.
2 It makes no sense in an age when a deadly poison
3 produced by a nuclear exchange would be carried by
4 wind and water and soil and seed to the far corners
5 of the globe and to generations as yet unborn.

6 "Today the expenditure of billions of
7 dollars every year on weapons acquired for the
8 purpose of making sure we never need them is
9 essential to the keeping of peace. But surely the
10 acquisition of such idle stockpiles, which can only
11 destroy and never create, is not the only, much less
12 the most efficient means of assuring peace. I speak
13 of peace, therefore, as the necessary rational end
14 of rational men.

15 "I realize the pursuit of peace is not as
16 dramatic as the pursuit of war and frequently the
17 words of the pursuers fall on deaf ears. But we
18 have no more urgent task."

19 God, do I wish we had a president that
20 could speak such words today. I also want to read
21 from Article 6 of the Nuclear Nonproliferation
22 Treaty. "Each of the parties to the treaty
23 undertake to pursue negotiations in good faith on
24 effective measures relating to secession of the
25 nuclear arms race at an early date, and to nuclear

1 disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete
2 disarmament under strict and effective international
3 control."

4 This says "at an early date." We signed
5 the NPT as a nation in the early 1970s, and these
6 people are still talking about building nuclear
7 weapons. When the NPT became ratified by our
8 country, according to this document, the
9 Constitution of the United States, it became the law
10 of the land. So these people are actually breaking
11 US law by advocating building more nuclear weapons,
12 and if there's any law enforcement officers here, I
13 say arrest these people for breaking the law. Thank
14 you.

15 MR. BROWN: Our next speaker is Floy
16 Barrett. I think she has some friends. J.S. Bach
17 wrote a delightful piece called "A Musical
18 Interlude" and I think we have them carrying on the
19 classical tradition. Floy will be followed by Dorie
20 Bunting.

21 MS. BARRETT: We're here for our
22 grandchildren's sake.

23 (Whereupon the Raging Grannies sang.)

24 With nuclear warheads, our future's at
25 stake.

1 There's no place to hide, there's no place
2 that's safe.

3 By making more bombs we're just making
4 more hate.

5 So we say no nukes for our grandchildren's
6 sake.

7 Oh, for our grandchildren's sake.

8 With hills of mine tailings and water
9 pollution,

10 For nuclear waste, there is no solution.

11 As women we know someone's got to clean
12 up.

13 So that's why we say, stop making this
14 stuff.

15 Oh, stop making this stuff.

16 They say that we need to replace the old
17 nukes.

18 Build bigger and better and uglier nukes.

19 But we know they're liars, there's too
20 much at stake.

21 So we say no nukes for our grandchildren's
22 sake.

23 Oh, for our grandchildren's sake.

24 Oh, dear, where does our money go?

25 Oh, dear, where does our money go?

1 Oh, dear, where does our money go?

2 Oh, dear, where does our money go?

3 Nuclear weapons and war.

4 Our kids need new schools and a lot more
5 good teachers.

6 We're needing a health plan with national
7 features.

8 A lovely green planet with peace for all
9 creatures.

10 Not nuclear weapons and war.

11 We all pay our taxes, we know that we
12 gotta.

13 We'd gladly shell out for some clean air
14 and water.

15 But who wants to pay for destruction and
16 slaughter by nuclear weapons and war.

17 We once got a warning from Dwight
18 Eisenhower

19 On militarism and corporate power.

20 His words have come true now and all the
21 world cowers from USA weapons and war.

22 Oh, dear, where does our money go?

23 Oh, dear, where does our money go?

24 Oh, dear, where does our money go?

25 Nuclear weapons and war.

1 MS. BARRETT: Thank you. Just a few weeks
2 ago I was wondering, what happened to "We, the
3 people"? Well, this transformation idea of the
4 nuclear complex has rekindled a fervor in us to come
5 together and to prevent New Mexico from becoming the
6 national sacrifice area. And that's what will
7 happen. That's what will happen if we go forward
8 with this plan.

9 I don't need to repeat anything that's
10 been said here before, but the problem with the
11 Los Alamos plan is that Los Alamos hasn't cleaned up
12 the mess that they have made for the last 50 years.
13 It's all in the canyon, it's washing down
14 whenever -- it's polluting our water, our
15 groundwater, our water in our river, it's still
16 there. They need to use this money for cleaning up
17 what they have already messed up. And we're going
18 to be drinking this water in a couple of months, and
19 it is imperative that we do something about all of
20 that waste that's still in the canyon because it
21 comes down and washes into the river.

22 And I want to note a particular thing that
23 wasn't mentioned in any of this, and that is that
24 the DOE and the National Nuclear Security
25 Administration is almost totally privatized. It

1 has -- all but 6 percent of the DOE appropriations
2 are going to war-mongering corporations. You know
3 who they are. Lockheed Martin, the Bechtel group.
4 I could go on. They're all listed here. And it's
5 no secret they are making lots of money off of
6 building nuclear weapons. Why are they privatizing?
7 We don't have any oversight left. Our Congress
8 doesn't have oversight left of Los Alamos National
9 Laboratories. So these incidents of accidents that
10 happen there, the last one being that -- well, you
11 all know about it. It was all in the papers.

12 But it's one of those things that we
13 cannot be assured of anything being safe at
14 Los Alamos. Right now they have a big hole up
15 there, that chemical and metallurgy building right
16 behind it. There's a big hole, and they're looking
17 at seismic activity, so people that grew up there
18 say that, you know, there's an earthquake fault
19 right there. So they will look at it, but will they
20 do anything about it? Will they change their whole
21 plan? It's something that, you know, I think -- it
22 just doesn't -- none of it is rational.

23 So I'm hoping that everyone here will join
24 us in our crusade now to prevent New Mexico from
25 becoming this national sacrifice area where they're

1 going to have the waste here, we're going to pollute
2 not just the water, but the air. The environment is
3 going to be totally changed, and so I think that all
4 of us can come together and we need to influence our
5 congressional delegation, and all of them are up for
6 election in this coming election except for Senator
7 Bingaman. So we have a chance to let them know,
8 before we're going to vote for them this time, that
9 they need to promise that they will not support this
10 kind of reproducing nuclear weapons. So I hope all
11 of you will join us in that campaign and crusade.

12 MR. BROWN: Dorie Bunting is next. And
13 then Dave Clark.

14 MS. BUNTING: As you can tell, a lot of us
15 are up in years and we've been doing this for a long
16 time, so it's pretty discouraging, but I'm sure it's
17 discouraging to Mr. Wyka, too, to sit here having to
18 listen to us.

19 But what I'm wondering about is why we
20 aren't putting equal effort around intelligence. I
21 mean, the tremendous intelligence as human beings
22 that we have into the social problems that we have
23 in the world today. I think this whole weapons
24 thing is a total anachronism. We can't put our
25 creative abilities into studying and experimenting

1 with human relationships, and particularly
2 international relationships, building community in
3 our global society, which is absolutely necessary
4 for our lives on earth to continue.

5 And I think -- I don't know how many
6 people were aware, because I don't think we hear
7 much about new initiatives. We don't hear anything
8 about them in our media. I don't know if you were
9 aware that the old cold warriors, George P. Schultz,
10 William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nunn have
11 launched a new effort to abolish nuclear weapons.
12 Would people raise their hands if they had heard
13 about this initiative? Well, that's good. Not a
14 majority, though. And I believe Hans Blix under
15 the sponsorship of the United Nations has had a
16 commission studying steps that can be taken in great
17 detail toward the same effort.

18 The gentlemen I mentioned just now had an
19 article in the Wall Street Journal in January 2008,
20 and I'll quote just a small quote from there, what
21 they said. "Accelerating spread of nuclear weapons,
22 nuclear know-how, and nuclear material has brought
23 us to a nuclear tipping point. We face a very real
24 possibility that the deadliest weapons ever invented
25 could fall into dangerous hands. The steps we are

1 taking now to address these threats are not adequate
2 to the danger. With nuclear weapons more widely
3 available, deterrence is decreasingly effective, and
4 increasingly hazardous.

5 "One year ago in an essay in this paper we
6 called for a global effort to reduce reliance on
7 nuclear weapons to prevent their spread into
8 potentially dangerous hands and ultimately to end
9 them as a threat to the world. The interests,
10 momentum, and growing political space that has been
11 created to address these issues over the past year
12 has been extraordinary, with strong positive
13 responses from people all over the world. Mikael
14 Gorbachev wrote in January 2007 that, as someone who
15 signed the first treaties on real reduction in
16 nuclear weapons, he thought it his duty to support
17 our call for urgent action. It is becoming clearer
18 that nuclear weapons are no longer a means of
19 achieving security. In fact, with every passing
20 year, they make our security more precarious."

21 So I think one thing we can do is support
22 these gentlemen, say "Hurrah for you, you have had a
23 change of heart, you have had a new vision, and
24 whatever we can do to support your effort, we'll do
25 it." Thank you.

1 MR. BROWN: Dave Clark is next, and then
2 Chelsea Collonge, you're next.

3 MR. CLARK: Hello. My name is David
4 Clark. I'm a Los Alamos National Laboratory fellow,
5 and I'm the director of the Seaborg Institute for
6 Transactinium Science. I have a pretty simple
7 message today. I represent a new generation of
8 scientists at Los Alamos. I have devoted my career
9 to cleaning up the legacy of the Cold War. My
10 efforts have helped to reduce the number of nuclear
11 weapons, they supported the ban on underground
12 nuclear tests and I have helped clean up the
13 environmental contamination of the Cold War. I
14 submit to you that the new generation that you're
15 looking at has the same goals as many of you here
16 today. We differ perhaps in how we get there, but
17 the goals are the same.

18 One of the things that I'm the most proud
19 of is, I led a scientific team to clean up the Rocky
20 Flats site. It took ten years to develop enough
21 scientific understanding to go in and clean up the
22 legacy of the Cold War. We saved \$30 billion for
23 the taxpayers. That's the new generation. And I'm
24 very proud of what we did there.

25 Personally, I believe the complex

1 transformation represents a natural and logical
2 means to achieve further legacy cleanup goals. It
3 will cut the size of the nuclear weapons complex in
4 half, it will support reducing the number of
5 weapons, it will replace aging facilities with
6 state-of-the-art laboratories with better security,
7 better safety, and better environmental compliance,
8 all the things that we've been talking about.

9 One of the things that I want to point out
10 as a scientist are a few facts for those who are
11 interested in informed debate. As we discuss
12 transformation, I want to remind everybody that
13 there are well over 2,000 metric tons of plutonium
14 in the world today. Now, regardless of your views
15 on how this situation came to be, everybody must
16 recognize that these inventories need to be
17 prudently managed for many centuries. It will have
18 to be stabilized and stored. It will have to be
19 secured against theft and diversion. We're going to
20 have to research modern nuclear reactor concepts to
21 burn down the inventories.

22 I want to tell a short story about some of
23 my colleagues who have been involved in dismantling
24 nuclear weapons and converting them into nuclear
25 energy. On a certain day, we cut open a pit, and we

1 converted it into a hydride and then do something
2 that could be used in nuclear fuel. And the silence
3 in the room was deafening because everybody
4 recognized that we had just taken a 100-kiloton
5 weapon off the street.

6 Now, I submit to you that these are
7 important things that are happening at the labs, and
8 it's going to take a new generation to make sure
9 that these things are done safely and securely. To
10 succeed, we're going to have to improve our
11 understanding of plutonium by continuing to work at
12 the frontiers of science. We're going to have to
13 continue to attract the next generation of
14 scientists and engineers with the quality and the
15 breadth necessary to deal with this important
16 problem.

17 Complex transformation to me is a positive
18 mechanism to achieve those goals. We're going to
19 need future facilities that are state of the art, so
20 that we don't have the problems with environmental
21 compliance that we had from previous generations.
22 So thank you very much.

23 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Chelsea, come on
24 up.

25 I just want to remind people, folks, this

1 is a cell phone, in case you didn't recognize it.
2 So again, please turn yours off. I don't know
3 whether those are music boxes or not, but I suspect
4 they were cell phones. So please don't interrupt
5 the speakers.

6 Chelsea, you're next, and Ellen Robinson
7 will be next.

8 MS. COLLONGE: My name is Chelsea
9 Collonge. I want to start by giving a shout out to
10 a young woman I met at the hearing today. Her
11 father works for Sandia Laboratory and I just want
12 to say that I have deep respect in my heart for all
13 those who believe that they're helping our national
14 security by working for Sandia or Los Alamos. I
15 also want to say that I think it's really important
16 that we're all here at the hearing today. This is a
17 good first step.

18 I think it's also important that when we
19 go home today, we take some time to take care of
20 ourselves, and then we figure out a way to integrate
21 what we've learned here into our social lives and
22 our spiritual lives, so that after today, we will
23 have new energy to get involved in an existing
24 nuclear abolition organization or connect with our
25 own creativity and invent a new way of acting to

1 create a safer future.

2 I'm involved with two organizations that
3 are located near two of the sites that have been
4 discussed by this proposal. I worked at Nevada
5 Desert Experience, which is a Franciscan
6 organization in Las Vegas. We campaign against
7 nuclear testing in Nevada. I also live here in
8 Albuquerque, and I'm part of an organization called
9 Trinity House Catholic Worker. We try to integrate
10 our lives in such a way that we're responsive to the
11 needs of the poorest folks in Albuquerque and that
12 we share their sufferings. We're also very
13 concerned about nuclear weapons.

14 Since both of these organizations are
15 Catholic, I wanted to speak from a Christian
16 perspective today. I don't believe that America is
17 a Christian nation, but I am aware that our
18 administration tends to think so, and tends to think
19 that they're offering Christian leadership, so I
20 wanted to provide a different example. I think that
21 there's really an important method of evaluation
22 that's missing from these documents. It's a method
23 that was given to us by Jesus, in Matthew, chapter
24 25. In that chapter, it's the last judgment, and
25 people are assembled, and Jesus is dividing them

1 into folks who will go to heaven and folks who will
2 go to hell. And the criterion he uses is: "Who
3 among you, when I was thirsty, gave me a drink?
4 When I was hungry, gave me food? When I was naked,
5 gave me clothing?"

6 And the people assembled there were like,
7 "Master, when did we do this to you?"

8 And he said, "When you did it to the
9 poorest among you."

10 So I'd like for this document to consider
11 what are all these policy alternatives going to do
12 for the poorest in our society and the poorest in
13 our world?

14 You know, right now is Lent, the season
15 where we prepare for Easter, and I know many
16 Catholics living here in Albuquerque, and I just
17 want to encourage all of us, whatever our religious
18 affiliation, that as we get ready for Easter, as we
19 make room in our hearts for resurrection, we also
20 look seriously at how we can make room in our
21 society for resurrection? How can we make room in
22 our collective future for resurrection? And to me,
23 you know, listening to this proposal, it's so clear
24 that resurrection is going to require a
25 reinvestment.

1 We need to take this \$150 billion and we
2 need to take it away from nuclear weapons, from
3 managing our stockpile, from building more bombs.
4 We need to invest that in the kind of programs that
5 are going to protect the environment from climate
6 change and that are going to provide resources for
7 poor and hungry folks here in Albuquerque and also
8 across the country.

9 You know, there's one other thing that I
10 just can't let slide in this document, and that's
11 the acronym for special nuclear materials. You
12 know, I think it's a real offense to the S&M
13 community here in Albuquerque and in the United
14 States, you know. This is a bedroom practice that
15 is consensual between two individuals, and nuclear
16 weapons are the opposite. Nuclear weapons are
17 nonconsensual. We're not talking about violence
18 between two people. We are talking about violence
19 that's inflicted on mass populations of people
20 living in cities around the world. So I'd like to
21 propose a new acronym. I think Particular Nuclear
22 Materials is better. The acronym there is PNM.

23 MR. BROWN: Ellen Robinson, you signed up.
24 Did you want to carry on, or do you want to pass at
25 this point and be called on later? What would you

1 like to do?

2 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: She's passing.

3 MR. BROWN: You can let me know if you
4 want to do anything.

5 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: She's gone.

6 MR. BROWN: Bob Press. Bob is here. And
7 Rosamund Evans will follow Bob.

8 MR. PRESS: I could just say, "No, no,
9 no." But I won't stop there. I would suggest that
10 Los Alamos and Sandia be transformed into a peace
11 research institute and spend their time finding ways
12 for peace. I have noticed as I looked out at the
13 audience that most of the people who are here from
14 Sandia and Los Alamos have a grim look on their
15 face. And as we peaceniks speak about saying no to
16 nuclear weapons, they don't seem happy. Is it their
17 jobs they're afraid to lose? Do they think about
18 what will happen if they build more bombs? I
19 thought they were proud of reducing the number of
20 bombs, and now I hear about them increasing the
21 number of bombs. New bombs. Better bombs. You can
22 kill more people. Isn't that what they're about?

23 I have been to a number of hearings over
24 the past seven years that I have lived in
25 New Mexico, and I come to the hearings and I listen

1 to people talk. I see about 5 percent of the people
2 speak for nuclear weapons, and 95 percent of the
3 people speak against nuclear weapons. But guess
4 what? At the end of all of these hearings, the DOE
5 and its compatriots recommend more bombs, more
6 things to destroy people, more things to kill their
7 children and their grandchildren.

8 So why do we have hearings? Is this just
9 a fake? We do this so people will think that we're
10 listening to the people? It certainly doesn't show
11 that we are listening well. I find it ironic that
12 the scientists, both old and new, speak in different
13 languages, but say the same thing, and yet they're
14 the wards of George Bush, who doesn't listen to
15 scientists. So why should he listen to you? You
16 mean death. We mean life. Thank you.

17 MR. BROWN: Rosamund Evans. She'll be
18 followed by Frances Rauch.

19 MS. EVANS: My name is Rosamund Evans.
20 I'm a citizen of New Mexico since 1974. I, too,
21 have come to many, many hearings, and I don't think
22 that I have anything as eloquent to say as I have
23 heard before I have come up to speak, and at many
24 other hearings. I think I come to hearings over and
25 over not because I think that we are listened to, as

1 the previous speaker was absolutely right. It's
2 always paid employees that are speaking for, on our
3 taxpayer dollar, by the way, and it's those of us
4 who spend our time and energy, our life force,
5 trying to prevent what they're talking about, and
6 we're not really heard. And I know that.

7 But I come because it is very encouraging
8 to me because we don't get it in our media, we don't
9 get it reported widely. It's encouraging to me to
10 hear my fellow citizens and know their thoughts and
11 how wonderfully they are working for community,
12 which is what it's going to take for us, and always
13 has taken, for us to survive on the planet. So I
14 guess I come for inspiration.

15 When I moved to New Mexico, I didn't
16 really understand anything about the weapons
17 production that has been going on here for 60 years.
18 I learned very quickly about the proposition for the
19 Waste Isolation Pilot Project and I also learned
20 quickly about the legacy of the uranium mining in
21 contact with the people that had experienced that
22 and continue through the generations to have that
23 legacy.

24 For these six decades that New Mexico has
25 suffered the ravages of the nuclear weapons cycle,

1 we have been deceived, we've been misinformed, we've
2 been uninformed by our government and by our elected
3 representatives. Los Alamos and Sandia have always
4 operated in secrecy and we don't really know the
5 amounts of money that our taxpayers sink in it,
6 either. The myth of the contribution to our
7 prosperity in New Mexico, the jobs created -- that's
8 a myth and we've supported it by our willingness to
9 be the cauldron for these weapons of mass
10 destruction of the planet. But it has resulted in
11 endless efforts on the part of citizens to inform
12 themselves and to resist the radioactive damage and
13 environmental damage to our land, our water, and our
14 future generations.

15 We continue to say no passionately, in
16 carefully documented ways that follow the protocol
17 required. We pay for lawsuits, we say no to weapons
18 testing, to storage, to transport, endless parts of
19 this, to uranium mining, to uranium processing, on
20 and on and on we inform ourselves. But what we get
21 is more of our tax dollars given to the corporations
22 to profit and we get also a much less secure world,
23 which has been spoken to.

24 We have a stockpile of around 10,000
25 warheads, but we have a demand for new weapons, new

1 nuclear weapons, that violate the Nuclear
2 Proliferation Treaty, put the entire planet at
3 increased risk; more flexible, more usable, more
4 reliable, more weapons, completely insane,
5 benefiting only the corporations that will endlessly
6 make the profit.

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

9 MS. EVANS: Thank you. We need investment
10 in life, not sickness and death. Our elected
11 representatives have not listened to us, but to the
12 corporations and the labs that contribute to their
13 campaigns. For our survival, we must eliminate
14 nuclear weapons, clean up the mess as best we can,
15 and live together on the planet as carefully as we
16 can. We cannot continue to allow the deceptions of
17 a full-spectrum dominance of the planet and the
18 space by nuclear means, by space, by nuclear means.
19 Go forward. Thank you for all of you who keep
20 working.

21 MR. BROWN: Frances Rauch is next.

22 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: She left because
23 she's not feeling very well and wants to know if I
24 can read her statement.

25 MR. BROWN: Certainly. Just again, if you

1 can identify yourself for the court reporter.

2 MS. WELOSTER: I'm Astrid Weloster. Okay,
3 I'll do the best I can with this. Frances would
4 like me to say, how do we count on nuclear for
5 security? It's not security. It's going to lead to
6 the death of us all. I thank you, God, for Jesus
7 Christ for saving us from such a nasty world. As
8 best I can read this, we need to make this into a
9 healthy place instead of another nuclear repository.
10 And that's only part of what she said.

11 In a couple of minutes, my phone is going
12 to ring, I think, because those two kids are going
13 to be in a car waiting downstairs, so I want to ask
14 your permission to read for about a minute and a
15 half.

16 MR. BROWN: Certainly.

17 MS. WELOSTER: As everybody was speaking,
18 I was looking at two charts behind me. They're
19 right to the right and left of the lady that's
20 standing next to you, Maria. Right straight in the
21 back of the room. No, not that way. Go the other
22 direction, toward the lady in front of you. That
23 one and the next one over. It talks about the
24 nuclear footprint being reduced, and here's a little
25 picture that I have drawn for you all, because

1 that's the nuclear footprint of New Mexico. And on
2 that chart it says absolutely nothing about a modern
3 pit facility in Los Alamos.

4 In fact, it talks about research
5 engineering development, all of that. It says
6 nothing about building, and I think that building is
7 actually what's going to happen, because I heard
8 Senator Pete Domenici say on the radio the other day
9 that before he leaves office, he wants to make sure
10 that the new facility for building plutonium pits is
11 completely paid for down there. So now I'm going to
12 quickly read a prepared message that I have.

13 We are gathered here today to speak
14 against the outrage of new buildings in which to
15 study, explore, and build a new generation of
16 nuclear weapons, ones which don't have the negative
17 baggage of having been dropped on Hiroshima and
18 Nagasaki, ones which we recognize today cause such
19 damage to innocent children, to the environment we
20 have harmed almost beyond repair in so many ways.
21 We gather to speak against wasting resources to
22 build a building no one needs, in which to build
23 plutonium pits when the last generation has lived
24 less than one-third of its useful life. Did I say
25 useful? The weapons themselves are actually useless

1 as they are now stockpiled because we have a law
2 against them. The Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty,
3 an international treaty and therefore a law of the
4 land since 1970s.

5 To our great collective detriment, this
6 law has been ignored by the very people charged with
7 keeping it. The people gathered here to hear your
8 voices today can hear no such thing. They are
9 indeed immune to hearing the cry for justice and
10 sustainability of future generations. They can only
11 hear the sirens song of salaries and retirement
12 packages. They are specifically trained not to hear
13 the frequencies of hope that we raise today. This
14 hearing does not technically let you speak out
15 against this outrage. It asks you only for comment
16 on the environmental ramifications of building a
17 CMRR, the euphemistic acronym designed to lead you
18 far away from the idea of a bomb plex.

19 Death hovers around Los Alamos in
20 concentric circles in the form of cancer and other
21 debilitating conditions which is hidden from our
22 view just like the CMRR and everything else they
23 have done for the past 65 years. They say the old
24 building is decrepit, but we are hearing from former
25 employees and some current ones that it is nothing

1 of the sort. A new CMRR is just a foot in the door
2 to make it hard to even look at new pit production
3 in a realistic way. You all came here today in an
4 effort to stop the outrage of a new generation of
5 weapons to hold the world hostage so other people
6 will continue to yield over half of the world's
7 resources to fewer than 5 percent of the world's
8 people. It is the only superficially smart thing
9 about nuclear weapons that they create terror and
10 neutralize resistance with 63-year-old images of
11 broken and charred children which most of our people
12 have never even seen.

13 MR. BROWN: Can you summarize in 30
14 seconds or so?

15 MS. WELOSTER: All right. Jumping to the
16 end, the nuclear industry has been trying to secure
17 the servitude of the American people, of their
18 voices, for the past 65 years. This building, being
19 designed as it is being built, before it is even
20 funded, is dependent on the American people being
21 duped again by the proposition that our liberty
22 depends on increasingly sacrificing others' lives to
23 our lifestyle. In short, for your freedom you get
24 another building in which a new nuclear weapon is
25 built in the vain hope that you are not sufficiently

1 awake to the urgent pleadings of the planet and its
2 people to take care of rather than sinking all
3 thought, all resources, into new plans for
4 destruction.

5 If a congressman aspiring to be senator
6 cannot hear the sound of another generation of
7 positive possibilities being flushed down the
8 nuclear toilet of mutually assured destruction, he
9 is not worth our vote and we must keep looking for
10 someone else. Thank you very much.

11 MR. BROWN: Lucille Cordova? Do you want
12 me to call on you again? Are you ready now, or do
13 you want to wait?

14 MS. CORDOVA: I think I'm going to skip.

15 MR. BROWN: If you decide, let me know.

16 Don Hancock, who is always prepared to
17 speak. Don will be followed by Harry Wilson.

18 MR. HANCOCK: Obviously, Holmes and I have
19 been at too many of these hearings when we joke
20 about this. My name is Don Hancock. I'm with
21 Southwest Research and Information Center here in
22 Albuquerque. SRIC provided oral comments at the
23 scoping meeting on December 5, 2006, written
24 comments on January 17, 2007. The draft bomb plex
25 SPEIS that's sitting over there does acknowledge

1 that we made those comments, but otherwise
2 substantially disregards them, as well as similar
3 comments by more than 30,000 other people who
4 commented during that process. Not surprisingly,
5 therefore, the draft SPEIS is a very inadequate
6 treatment, of very serious issues regarding what
7 kind of nuclear weapons complex should the US have
8 for the next century, if any?

9 If DOE is to have a legally adequate
10 SPEIS, it must substantially rewrite that draft and
11 reissue it for, guess what, we have to come back
12 again, and talk to them again about it. We have to
13 have another round of public comment.
14 Unfortunately, the Department of Energy likely won't
15 do that because of a political decision apparently
16 made in the White House or on the seventh floor of
17 the Forrestal Building, where the Department of
18 Energy is housed in Washington, to have some basis
19 for the current administration to make decisions
20 before it leaves office. And you saw that in one of
21 Ted's slides that had the timeframe. It's the next
22 administration and the next Congress that's supposed
23 to be implementing what this administration wants to
24 do before it leaves office. However, that political
25 strategy will not work, will not succeed, and no one

1 should think it will.

2 Just as tens of thousands of people argued
3 more than a year ago against the bomb plex, so even
4 more people are arguing now. Ted said before this
5 meeting even started he had something like 40,000
6 comments already on this one. I haven't seen them,
7 but my guess is a huge majority of them are opposed
8 to what is being proposed. Furthermore, this
9 political approach that seems to be being followed
10 is so contrary to the requirements of the National
11 Environmental Policy Act that when lawsuits are
12 filed, even administration judges are likely to say
13 that it has to be redone and start over.

14 The discussion of alternatives is at the
15 legal heart of the National Environmental Policy
16 Act. All reasonable alternatives are supposed to be
17 described and discussed and analyzed. But this
18 draft leaves out the alternative that 95 percent or
19 more of the people asked for, more than a year ago,
20 which is -- and it goes by different names. The
21 current name that a lot of people around the country
22 are using is a no-weapons production alternative.

23 Let me read from the draft, its basic
24 rationale for not doing what the people have asked
25 it to do and what it is legally required to do. The

1 draft states -- this is a quote -- "Does not analyze
2 alternatives to the United States national security
3 policy. Rather, it examines the environmental
4 effects of proposed actions and reasonable
5 alternatives for execution of the program based on
6 the existing policy and foreseeable changes in this
7 policy."

8 In other words, this administration cannot
9 even conceive of a future administration that would
10 want to comply by Article 6 of the nonproliferation
11 treaty that has been mentioned.

12 MR. BROWN: Don, excuse me. You have got
13 about a minute left.

14 MR. HANCOCK: Even though this decision
15 this administration can't conceive of, we can, and
16 fortunately, a lot of other people around the
17 country can conceive of it. Unfortunately, another
18 thing that this document can't conceive of and one
19 of the things we specifically asked for and was
20 ignored in our earlier comments, is an analysis of
21 the environmental impacts of actually using those
22 nuclear weapons. That's the kind of information
23 that the public, the world, the next administration,
24 should know. So it's not just the pictures of
25 Hiroshima and Nagasaki that we have been shown

1 today, but even more devastation than that.

2 Another thing that the public and
3 decision-makers need to know are what the costs of
4 these things would be, and not in this document but
5 in one of the referenced documents, the independent
6 business case analysis of consolidation options for
7 the defense programs SNM and weapons production
8 missions, and I quote it, "NNSA spends \$1.8 billion,
9 including \$200 million for transportation, annually
10 on special nuclear materials, of which about \$300
11 million is devoted to new construction or
12 renovation."

13 At least an anticipated \$100 million per
14 year will be required for routine maintenance of
15 that existing stuff, thus at a constant budget level
16 only -- only -- \$200 million annually would be
17 available for construction of new facilities.
18 Clearly, this is insufficient for implementation of
19 any of the consolidation options on the schedules
20 proposed in the SPEIS. In other words, all of those
21 alternatives that Ted talked to us about are
22 unaffordable. That's a good thing, but we do need
23 to talk about what needs to happen instead. I'm
24 going to finish, Holmes.

25 MR. BROWN: Okay.

1 MR. HANCOCK: So another inadequacy of
2 this draft is, it doesn't even inform the public and
3 the policymakers of what the cost of that preferred
4 alternative is, that it cannot be funded even by the
5 existing nuclear weapons budget, and despite all of
6 the discussion you have heard today about
7 dismantlement and reduction, our current nuclear
8 weapons budget is about the same as at the peak of
9 the Cold War, when all those things were being made.

10 So whether you want to call it, as some of
11 the Los Alamos people don't want to call it, new
12 nuclear bombs or just maintaining what we've got and
13 what they hope to have in the future, it's going to
14 cost even more than what we're spending now.
15 Another good reason to say no. Thank you.

16 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Sorry to be so
17 insistent about the time. But we're actually only
18 about halfway through the folks who signed up. So
19 our next speaker is Harry Wilson, and Katie Stone
20 will follow Harry. Is Harry here? Okay, well, I'll
21 get back to him. Katie Stone is available.

22 MS. STONE: Hello, I'm Katie Stone. I am
23 a mother of two children with complex neurological
24 disabilities who were both born and raised here in
25 Albuquerque, and though I know that the good folks

1 at Los Alamos and Sandia would not like me to point
2 my finger at you and say, "What is it in my
3 irrigated water and land that is coming from your
4 plant in LANL and going into my garden," I don't
5 know, I kind of blame you. Sorry. But I do want to
6 say that I am also from your public radio station,
7 KUNM. We are the only public radio station that has
8 a human being in the station 24 hours a day, so when
9 the inevitable accident happens with you guys, don't
10 worry. We'll let everybody know because we're
11 actually there. Unless, of course, it's at Sandia,
12 and we can't let you know because we're part of the
13 incinerated bunch.

14 I know that you might not be listening to
15 our comments today, for real, and like your
16 decisions are already made, but for me, it's
17 unconscionable for me to not comment, because I feel
18 that if I didn't come here and comment today, that I
19 would be acquiescing and complicit to this plan, and
20 I am not complying with your plan. I am not
21 acquiescing to your plan, as many people here today
22 are by evidence showing that we actually feel that
23 by being here, we're showing you, in addition to our
24 written comments, that there is true opposition to
25 this plan.

1 I truly do applaud the downsizing that you
2 all are doing in the facilities. I think that's
3 wonderful. I also want to applaud what David Clark
4 said about how he has been working on plans to make
5 our weapons into something useful. And I do
6 appreciate that that is happening there. When David
7 said that there are 2000 metric tons of plutonium in
8 the world today -- and I'm quoting you, David --
9 stabilized, stored, and protected, but do they need
10 to be made into new weapons? That's the issue I
11 think that brought many of us out of our jobs today
12 to come over here and tell you. We do not want new
13 weapons. We do not want new plutonium pits.

14 I'm a tad bit horrified in reading all of
15 this documentation to find out that current
16 production of new plutonium pits is at 20 pits per
17 year, so you're already creating new pits. We're
18 doing that today. It's happening right now. And
19 although that's probably not David Clark's
20 department, God bless him -- he's doing actual
21 valuable work -- there's somebody else over there
22 whose department that is, and they're making new
23 weapons. This directly conflicts with our
24 international treaty obligations. We are obliged to
25 be nonproliferating.

1 And I just want to remind everybody of the
2 precedent that our wonderful country, which I love
3 so much, has set for countries that dare to create
4 weapons of mass destruction. Do we remember that
5 precedent that got set? It's kind of ugly, isn't
6 it? That's the precedent we set in the world. So
7 now what we've done is, we've made it okay. It's
8 okay for other countries now, I guess, to come in
9 and say to us, "You're making weapons of mass
10 destruction."

11 I don't want to be part of that. None of
12 us want to be part of that. I have two little kids.
13 They are the future. They have all kinds of great
14 ideas about what we can do with our nuclear energy,
15 just like you are doing new and different things
16 with the technology. There are many uses, but I
17 would say the first misuse would be to create new
18 weapons. And that's clearly part of this plan.
19 Clearly part of this plan is to create new weapons,
20 and that is why so many of us are opposed. I had an
21 idea of what could be happening at LANL and Sandia,
22 and in furthering what Mr. Clark was saying is
23 happening up at LANL, here's some ideas I have.

24 MR. BROWN: About one minute.

25 MS. STONE: We have a great crisis in our

1 climate change. Let's work on that with our
2 brilliant minds like David's over here. Let's work
3 on that. How about securing our ports? We haven't
4 really done that very well. I can tell you
5 firsthand that I know that people can sneak stuff
6 into this country all the time. All the time. How
7 many of us have gone international and not declared
8 everything? Well, guess what? People are going to
9 be bringing in undeclared things like you won't
10 believe. Can we use this technology to stop some of
11 the most dangerous stuff from being brought into our
12 country, perhaps? How about electronic
13 communications? Could LANL and Sandia be working on
14 securing those? Those are not secure, not at all.
15 Not at all. We saw what happened in LA when the
16 electricity went out.

17 And what about this last remaining thing,
18 and then I'll be done. Remember the art of
19 diplomacy? What happened to that? What happened to
20 that beautiful skill of diplomacy? It works a lot
21 better than bombs. We see what happens in modern
22 warfare. Look at Baghdad right now. Look at modern
23 warfare. We're so modern, we can't even get out.
24 Look at Sudan. They're so modern in Sudan, you
25 know, poor Sudan. Look at Sudan. That's modern

1 warfare for you, berserk war syndrome. People go
2 nuts. They do things that are unconscionable, like
3 creating new nuclear weapons in the state of
4 New Mexico, in my mind, is unconscionable. Thank
5 you. And please allow my comments to be reflected
6 in the record of decision. Thank you.

7 MR. BROWN: Is Harry Wilson back? Sally
8 Alice Thompson is next. Okay, I'll come back to
9 folks. Susan Rodriguez.

10 MS. THOMPSON: I'm Sally Alice Thompson.
11 I'm a member of Raging Grannies, obviously, and also
12 a member of Veterans for Peace and a few other
13 organizations. We're supposed to be talking about
14 the environmental impact. Well, there's a list here
15 of some of the aspects of the environment, but
16 there's one glaring omission, and that's ethics.
17 What kind of ethical environment do we want to have
18 in this country? We have the environment where we
19 have the blatant hypocrisy of blaming Iran for
20 wanting to build a nuclear weapon, and we're talking
21 about building 200. Is that ethical? I don't know.
22 If it is, I don't understand it. It's beyond my
23 comprehension. We have a golden rule that we should
24 act the way we want others to act. And that's basic
25 to ethics. And I don't believe that building

1 nuclear bombs and requiring other nations not to
2 build them is doing unto others as we would have
3 them do unto us. Thank you.

4 MR. BROWN: Susan Rodriguez? JoAnn
5 Calkins will be next.

6 MS. RODRIGUEZ: Hi. My name is Susan
7 Shelton Rodriguez, and I went out of my way to look
8 for someone who is just like myself so I could learn
9 how to get along, and I have been working on a
10 marriage for 36 years, and it's hard to get along,
11 not only a man, who's different from me, but a
12 person from a different culture and a different
13 religion. And by the way, I was brought up Jewish,
14 but now I'm Unitarian. And the Unitarians have a
15 lot of people from Sandia down here. And I want to
16 talk first towards that. They have their
17 explanations about why they're not building weapons.
18 Well, I don't believe it, and now we all know that
19 they're building plutonium pits and they built at
20 least, what, 20 a day. I heard they built over 100
21 and they plan to build 200 or 400.

22 You come to the Unitarian Church. Please
23 don't tell me that you're for peace. And I think
24 that this is where my comments go. We have to work
25 on the people here who do this kind of work and try

1 to figure out where they're coming from. If they're
2 coming from a political position, it's going to be
3 hard work, because you still have people who still
4 have, you know, "Viva Bush" on their car and that's
5 really hard for me to understand that after the
6 fiasco of eight years.

7 But we have other people who do have a
8 hard time. And from my own family, my husband does
9 have a Ph.D. and he does look at photo
10 interpretation, and he will not go up to Sandia and
11 make two or three times more. He works for the
12 State Engineer's office and looks at the water and
13 does the mapping and is an expert witness to make
14 sure people get their allotted water.

15 But we have other people who go up to
16 Sandia and go into Los Alamos and make hundreds of
17 thousands of dollars, and they're up to no good.
18 And if they have a conscience -- and some of these
19 people do, because they do come to the church -- we
20 have to work on them. We have to talk to them. We
21 have to change their minds. And that's the private
22 diplomacy that we all have to work on in our own
23 backyards.

24 And then we have what this person from
25 KUNM said about diplomacy. Diplomacy has not been

1 used in eight years. Going into Iraq like that was
2 just horrendous. How do we teach our children to be
3 peaceful and not to fight with each other? That is
4 from a personal point of view.

5 And from a world point of view, making
6 more weapons means they plan to use it. This whole
7 thing about the deterrent is BS. They plan to use
8 it, they want to dominate space, and that accident
9 that happened, so-called accident that happened,
10 recently about this pilot flying over the United
11 States with six bombs -- I met a local lieutenant
12 colonel from the Air Force, and he said what is
13 needed is not more bombs. And I said, "Would you
14 come here and say that?"

15 No, he's still commissioned so he's not
16 going to say it. One thing they need to work on --
17 and you guys probably know that it's not more
18 bombs -- the making of bombs is making more money.
19 It's all about money because we have enough bombs.
20 What they need to do -- and we should really think
21 about -- is the delivery, and that's why this whole
22 thing was BS, too. This guy didn't have any way to
23 deliver it, and we all know that. It's not that he
24 didn't have it. He couldn't deliver it. So once
25 they work on how to deliver it, then we really ought

1 to be careful, because once -- they're already up in
2 space and they want to deflect bombs or drop it from
3 space with lasers or whatever, but delivering the
4 thing -- and take it from an expert, and that's not
5 me, it's this colonel here that says that. And that
6 really scares me.

7 And I have already been here 20 years and
8 I was brought up over in New York, and I was always
9 brought over to the United Nations to protest
10 against nuclear weapons. And then in 1989 when my
11 daughter was born, we had the so-called end of the
12 Cold War, but this has really gone haywire. And
13 this is very upsetting. We're polluting the land,
14 we're polluting the earth, we're going to be
15 drinking the filthy water.

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

17 MS. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah. I should probably
18 use my -- okay, terrorism. Worldwide terrorism.
19 Terrorists come from people who are unhappy, who are
20 angry about the political situation. They're people
21 who don't have health care, don't have education.
22 And by the way, we don't have education in this
23 state, too. My daughter almost didn't learn how to
24 read here, so we need more money in education. We
25 need to educate people to be able to think. We need

1 critical thinking. We need people to be able to
2 talk to each other. We need to feed our
3 populations. That's where terrorism comes from.
4 And to say, you know, we're going to use these bombs
5 to stop terrorism, give me a break. That is so -- I
6 mean, go tell it to yourselves. We don't believe
7 it. That's just not true. Thank you.

8 MR. BROWN: JoAnn Calkins. And then Donna
9 Detweiler.

10 MS. CALKINS: I'm a native New Mexican.
11 My father homesteaded in New Mexico, and there were
12 many people that lived here before me, I'm sure,
13 that were Spaniards, there were Indians, there were
14 prehistoric people that lived here before. None of
15 us ever invited the nuclear industry into
16 New Mexico. It was all done in the same way,
17 nonconsensual, and as a child, I think I was born
18 into a nuclear-free New Mexico. That's what I want
19 back. I hope I represent the New Mexicans that are
20 suffering on the Navajo reservation, that are still
21 breathing that dust from the mines that were dug up
22 there that are still open-air. None of them have
23 been covered up.

24 I know that none of us want to be a
25 national sacrifice area, and we know that New Mexico

1 was not chosen as a site for Los Alamos Labs, for
2 Sandia Labs, for White Sands Testing Ground, for
3 WIPP, because we are a beautiful state. But we are
4 a beautiful state and we want to live here. And we
5 do not want our children to have to grow up
6 breathing contaminated air, drinking contaminated
7 water, and we should have something to say about
8 whether those facilities are here or not. I would
9 like to say that as former speakers noted, there was
10 no alternative mentioned in all of your alternatives
11 for no nuclear weapons, no production. We worry
12 about job loss in New Mexico. But I need to tell
13 you that those people who are employed in the
14 nuclear weapons industries -- they are not forced to
15 work there. There are other jobs available for
16 them, and I think they need to take on that personal
17 responsibility that -- you know, find another job.
18 There are jobs that could be done in New Mexico that
19 would be constructive for us. We're certainly a
20 state that needs a lot of things. We're very needy.
21 Help us.

22 The other thing I'd like to say is that I
23 would like to look forward to a new future. I think
24 New Mexico has a great potential in producing
25 alternative energy, in helping different community

1 groups live together peacefully. We really are a
2 very diverse community, and I'm proud to be here. I
3 have actually lived in California for 30 years. I
4 just moved back. I love New Mexico. It's like this
5 is the place where I want to spend the rest of my
6 life. And I see so much potential in it.

7 In the future, I think all of us, not only
8 in Albuquerque, New Mexico, but in the United States
9 and in the whole world, want to be able to look
10 forward to the future with hope. Nuclear does not
11 give us hope. Thinking about nuclear, the best we
12 can think of is that we'll be the strongest, meanest
13 people in the world, and we could keep everybody
14 else under our thumbs, so that you know, we can
15 survive as long as we can. That can't go on
16 forever.

17 MR. BROWN: You have got a minute left.

18 MS. CALKINS: So here's what I want to
19 look forward to. I want us to spend as much money
20 on energy on seeking peace as we do on war. I want
21 us to take care of our people all over the world,
22 because they are our brothers and sisters. And I
23 want us to control our government and our
24 corporations because they have their own selfish
25 interests. We need to control them, to work for the

1 benefit of people. I want us to save the planet by
2 funding and giving people jobs, using our
3 intelligence and our ingenuity and our brainy
4 scientists to solve the problems that we have in the
5 world.

6 And finally, I want us to be able to look
7 back in the future and regard war just as we regard
8 slavery, which existed in our country only 150 years
9 ago, as a total waste of human energy and as a
10 terrible shame in our whole history of human
11 history. I hope that we'll survive long enough to
12 see these things come about, and I'd like New Mexico
13 to be the place where this starts. Our nuclear
14 stuff started right here in New Mexico. Let's end
15 it here.

16 MR. BROWN: Donna Detweiler, and then
17 Sylviana.

18 MS. DETWEILER: Good afternoon. I'm
19 Donna. And I am so grateful for the chance to bring
20 my perspective to bear on this environmental impact
21 plutonium pit production at Los Alamos. My daughter
22 is getting married at summer solstice, and I'm
23 starting to think a little bit about grandchildren.
24 So first of all, my mind went back to when Danielle
25 and her brother, Dillon, were kids and we studied

1 New Mexico rivers one fall. We didn't just read
2 about them in books or draw maps of them. We
3 actually waded across the Rio Grande at the nature
4 center, we mud wrestled at Rio Puerco, chased
5 minnows in the Pecos over by Villanueva. And
6 thinking back, I suppose we probably should have
7 tested the water for Giardia or radionuclides before
8 sticking our heads in it, but we never got sick from
9 it, and we had some grand adventures getting
10 intimate with the lifeblood of this state.

11 So I'm thinking about my grandchildren.
12 And I want them to be able to freeze their feet
13 without fear in Frijoles Creek, and to let the Jemez
14 Run through their fingers without wearing rubber
15 gloves, and to eat trout from the big river without
16 starting to glow. I refuse to cave in to the
17 despair of that. I don't want to whine today.

18 I want to propose a grand enema, if I may
19 be so bold. I would like to give an enema to the
20 scourge of yellowcake mining in the west, to give an
21 enema to the mirage of plutonium power in the north,
22 to give an enema to the pollution of the earth's
23 bowels in the south. I am ready to clear out the
24 whole big-stick approach and instead to get an
25 industry of carrots, of clean energy production,

1 remediating those contaminated sites and conserving
2 our beloved waters.

3 I consider this the only reasonable
4 alternative, the most cost-effective, the most
5 secure, the most safe. I see grandchildren with joy
6 in their hearts because they go to school in natural
7 light and rooftop gardens with carrots. I see
8 grandchildren free from the fear of war. I see
9 grandchildren embracing a new human vocation, of
10 creation, generosity, and compassion because we
11 managed to mobilize a project for greenhouse gas
12 reduction before the planet plunged into holocaust.

13 I challenge New Mexico congressional
14 candidates to make these goals part of their
15 platforms for the election this fall, for the sake
16 of all our grandchildren. Thank you.

17 MR. BROWN: Sylviana? And Geraldine Amato
18 will be next.

19 MS. d'ONVILLE: Good afternoon. This is a
20 little redundant, but I'm so overwhelmed and
21 horrified by the prospect, I'm kind of committed to
22 what I wrote earlier on. So I'm a dual citizen of
23 New Mexico, 330 years on one side of the family, and
24 maybe 700 on the other side of the family. We've
25 been here a while. If the bomb plex is indeed a job

1 creation or preservation gimmick, I suggest that the
2 individuals involved do what everybody else does in
3 this downsizing economy. Go back, retool, retrain,
4 learn a useful trade. Fix the levees. Build
5 bridges. Cure cancer. Maybe get us out of our
6 place just a little about Mississippi on the
7 economic level. That money could do so much. I
8 have a little hope you'll relinquish your grip on
9 our national budget and your comparatively
10 comfortable lifestyles. I have relatives that work
11 at Sandia. They have bigger cars and nicer houses.
12 Hell, if I didn't have to sell my soul to the devil,
13 I might work there myself.

14 I'm pretty cynical about your newfound
15 cultural and environmental sensitivities. They've
16 pretty much trashed our state. You have disposed of
17 your nuclear waste in the most crude manner
18 imaginable. Practically speaking, you only need one
19 weapon for every member in the axis of evil.
20 Really. And then a couple more for any country
21 unwilling to relinquish its natural resources on the
22 cheap, the United States. I would like to
23 furthermore see everybody complicit in this
24 transformation plan, to move to New Mexico, bring
25 your own water. We're a larger target than ever

1 with this new plan. And if everyone is so certain
2 about the safety and the efficacy and security of
3 their technology, let them come and share our fate,
4 let them drink our water, let them breathe our air,
5 let them raise their grandchildren. I hope to God
6 we have grandchildren. Thank you.

7 MR. BROWN: Geraldine Damato? Dave McCoy?
8 And Dave will be followed by Judith Kidd.

9 MR. McCOY: Hello. My name is Dave McCoy.
10 I'm the director for Citizen Action New Mexico.
11 We've been involved for several years with looking
12 at waste problems at Sandia National Laboratories,
13 specifically the mixed waste landfill that has
14 700,000 cubic feet of radioactive and hazardous
15 waste in it. And over the last year that I have
16 been director, I have read a 20,000-page
17 administrative study and discovered a whole lot of
18 things about the mixed waste landfill, and it
19 doesn't have any monitoring wells that go to the
20 groundwater like the law requires.

21 Recently I looked at 26 -- actually 31 --
22 waste dumps that are going to just be left in place,
23 and I have to tell you, I thought I was going to
24 vomit after reading it. They have pumped billions
25 and billions of gallons of toxic and radioactive

1 waste into these different dumps out there at
2 Sandia, and they have no monitoring wells that are
3 efficient that are close to the waste release sites.
4 They're in violation of federal law for every one of
5 these sites, just about. All of them were what's
6 called regulated units that have had to have
7 permits. They never got permits.

8 I'm telling you folks at Sandia, you think
9 you're smart. You think you're doing a good thing
10 out there. You are not. You have seriously
11 contaminated the air and water and you have plans
12 for a thermal treatment unit to burn out in the open
13 air high explosive wastes that may contain barium,
14 beryllium, uranium depleted uranium and God knows
15 what else, because you won't talk about it.

16 Now, I have got 14 Freedom of Information
17 Act requests asking all kinds of information, and
18 you people have sat on that stuff for over a year.
19 Now, I see certain of you that sit there and you
20 have got these kind of smirks on your face, you
21 know. But I'm telling you, this bomb plex thing is
22 going to go down in flames, and I'll tell you why.
23 I'll tell you why. You have got an analysis here, a
24 legal analysis, that says that you don't have to
25 look at the no-production alternative, and the

1 problem with that is that you have no citation that
2 you can point to in the Atomic Energy Act or the
3 nuclear posture review that legally says you're
4 compelled to go forward with the design,
5 development, and production of nuclear weapons.

6 Now, you're not going to get away with
7 this report here. It's going to be challenged in
8 the courts. It's a waste of time. It doesn't
9 consider the environmental effects that it should
10 consider. And those have to be related to a
11 no-production alternative. Okay? Now, I knew there
12 was a lot of Sandia employees at this thing today.
13 I could tell, because I saw all these bumper
14 stickers out there at Doubletree's hotel parking lot
15 that said, "Proud parent of a future nuclear bomb
16 maker." You know? Now, we've got enough. We've
17 got enough. We've got too many.

18 You're talking about moving special
19 nuclear material out of Albuquerque. Let's move
20 2000 bombs out of Albuquerque. That's the nuclear
21 material we want to get out of Albuquerque. You've
22 got 2000 bombs for 600,000 people. That's one bomb
23 for 300 people. Okay? Are we safe yet? Oh, no,
24 we're not safe yet. We're going to make 20 more to
25 200 pits more. What's it going to be, Mr. Wyka? Is

1 it going to be 200 pits or 20 pits? That's a
2 magnitude of 10 times. That's ten times the
3 environmental problems.

4 Now, you're talking about a new pit
5 facility up there. Okay. The old pit facility has
6 been called by the Defense Nuclear Facility Safety
7 Board unsafe. And it sits atop an earthquake fault
8 that has had three earthquakes within the Holocene
9 period. You cannot build legally in that kind of
10 position. The new CMRR is on the Pajarito -- within
11 the Pajarito earthquake zone.

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

13 MR. McCOY: I could go on for another 30,
14 I tell you.

15 MR. BROWN: We've got a number of --

16 MR. McCOY: I understand. I understand.
17 You're taking away from my minute.

18 So anyhow, you know, this is the greatest
19 criminal waste of minds, money, and resources in the
20 history of the world. That's what you people are
21 involved in, you know? The calls for you to retool,
22 get another job, look at your career, do something
23 else -- you know, they're really in order. Hans
24 Bethe, the most senior surviving scientist from the
25 Manhattan Project, who received the '67 Nobel Prize

1 for describing fusion in stars, told President
2 Clinton in 1997 that the US already had enough
3 weapons for its security, and that the US should
4 declare it is not working to develop further weapons
5 of mass destruction of any kind, should not finance
6 new designs, and should not work on new types of
7 nuclear weapons such as pure fusion weapons.

8 Now, you folks are planning on going
9 ahead, and we are going to do our best to stop you.
10 We're going to do our best to stop you. This kind
11 of welfare program for nuclear scientists and
12 laboratories is intolerable, given the social needs
13 that are out there in our society. If you cannot do
14 something positive in New Mexico, reduce the number
15 of weapons, stop the environmental contamination, we
16 want you to pack your bags and leave this state.
17 Thank you.

18 MR. BROWN: Judith Kidd? And Marjorie
19 Williams will be next.

20 MS. KIDD: Hi, I'm Judith Kidd, and I
21 don't have a lot of facts, but I have heard so many
22 really wonderful speeches today and many people
23 spoke from the heart, and others had such data, and
24 I think we've all stated clearly that we're so
25 against any more plutonium pits, any more atom

1 bombs, any more nuclear issues.

2 So I just want to say I reinforce that,
3 and I think that we are a very wise species, and it
4 confuses me that the human species, which in so many
5 ways is so capable, and yet we somehow have this one
6 blind spot which stops us from looking ahead. We
7 tend to look at the present and we build for the
8 present and we live at the present, but we forget to
9 look ahead, and I think it hurt civilizations in the
10 past.

11 They haven't noticed that the rain was
12 stopping. They haven't noticed that they were
13 chopping down the trees, and they weren't going to
14 be able to leave their island and have trade. And
15 we're some of the smartest people in our country,
16 the people that seem to be the most successful, the
17 ones that get to the top, according to the
18 mainstream. These people can be great leaders, but
19 where is the thinking ahead? Where is the thinking
20 about the children, the grandchildren, and the seven
21 generations? We really need to look at that.

22 It's so obvious that our planet is in
23 trouble. I think the least educated person can say
24 that. It's so obvious that storms are increasing,
25 there are oil spills, there's clouds in the sky,

1 there are more fires in the southwest. There's just
2 great danger that is so clear. And yet somehow the
3 smartest can't see it. I want everybody, all that
4 young generation of scientists over there that I
5 hear talking -- I want you to think about it. I
6 think you can make a change. It's the 21st century
7 now. It's not the 10th century. We need to change.
8 We need to rethink. We need to look ahead and say,
9 "What's it going to be like in 200 years if we build
10 all these bombs?"

11 But what's it going to be like if we learn
12 to negotiate and think about ourselves as one of
13 this planet, one of the species, one of the
14 creations on this planet? We are one of them. We
15 are not the top. Our country is one country, not
16 the top. Let's look at it that way. If we look at
17 it that way, and we care, we communicate, maybe
18 we'll have a world in 200 years that's still viable
19 and that we have a planet that's healthy and
20 children that are healthy. Please. I really,
21 really ask you guys that probably think you're doing
22 the best thing. Really think about it. And I ask
23 everybody to -- I know you all think about it, and
24 thanks for everybody for being here.

25 MR. BROWN: Marjorie Williams. And Sharon

1 Gross will be next.

2 MS. WILLIAMS: We are living in different
3 times, even different from those a couple of years
4 ago in the 2030 hearings. Our economy is threatened
5 by ill adventures in Iraq, and remotivated real
6 estate dealings. Also our food supply is under
7 threat. There are already food riots in seven
8 countries, including Mexico. Pakistan has
9 reintroduced rationing. Each day I receive
10 information on new dangers of global warming.
11 However, along with some good ideas from other
12 countries, not many from the United States.

13 Have you noticed the number of books out
14 lately about end times? And I'm not talking about
15 the religious end times, either. My nephew is a
16 college professor of physics. He says many of the
17 physicists he talks with wish that nuclear weapons
18 had never been invented. We did not need any more
19 weapons. We have enough of them. I fear that some
20 would use them to protect our overabundant
21 lifestyle. The dangers of falling into terrorists
22 hands might be from our own country. We wouldn't
23 have to depend on the nuclear and we would have
24 many, many jobs here in New Mexico.

25 Have you seen the 2009 president's budget,

1 cutting everything, many things, needed for our
2 country, while the military still stays up there
3 overpowering anything. And of course, now every one
4 of us owes at least \$30,000 of the national debt.
5 Our senators are being too timid. Senator Bingaman,
6 we do not need any more weapons. Congressman Udall,
7 don't you remember how many of us spoke at the last
8 hearings on 2030? Did you think nobody was speaking
9 against pits?

10 I have met some of the victims of
11 Hiroshima who came to New York after the war for
12 medical healing. We have moral, economic,
13 environmental, and social reasons for not producing
14 any nuclear weapons. The time is now.

15 MR. BROWN: Sharon Gross is next. She'll
16 be followed by Geraldine Amato.

17 MS. GROSS: My name is Sharon Gross, and
18 I'm struck by how important key assumptions are in
19 this whole process. The document says that the
20 National Nuclear Security Administration requires
21 their organization to design, produce, and maintain
22 nuclear weapons, and that is given as a reason for
23 proceeding with the proposed environmental
24 assessment. I think that it's really, really
25 important to look at basic assumptions because they

1 are like a row of dominos. It's like the first
2 assumption, and you have this line of things up
3 there, and when you have that one assumption and it
4 goes one way, then it just starts moving everything
5 else down the line. So I see, you know, the whole
6 environmental assessment is triggered by this
7 mission drive of designing, producing, and
8 maintaining nuclear weapons.

9 I think that right now it's premature to
10 proceed with certain parts of the proposals,
11 specifically further plutonium pit production. I
12 think that the assumption of continued design
13 production and maintenance of nuclear weapons is
14 very much open to question at this time. As was
15 stated earlier, the Defense Authorization Act that
16 was just passed called for a thorough review of our
17 nuclear posture. The imperative that is being
18 presented today as the imperative for the whole
19 process was developed in the nuclear posture review
20 early in the Bush Administration, and now many
21 people are realizing that we need a different
22 imperative.

23 The Congress, when it passed and
24 considered the defense authorization bill, said that
25 there was no convincing rationale for maintaining

1 large numbers of existing Cold War nuclear weapons,
2 and much less for producing additional warheads.
3 And they asked for a thorough and public review of
4 our whole nuclear posture. So until that is
5 completed -- which will not happen in this
6 administration -- it is premature to prepare
7 facilities for a whole plan that is likely to be
8 out-of-date.

9 In addition, even with the present
10 situation, there's a question as to how many pits
11 you really need. We are in the process of honoring
12 our strategic offensive reduction treaty, and the
13 proposal, as I understand it, is that within a few
14 years the United States would have 1,000 to 3,000
15 warheads. With those number of warheads, we don't
16 need the type of pit production that's been
17 proposed.

18 In addition, it's been determined that
19 existing pits would last for 100 years, another
20 reason that there's not a need at this time to
21 produce additional pits.

22 Another reason would be our budget
23 implication. As has been stated earlier, the cost
24 of various proposals is very high and we face a time
25 when we are having an increasing budget crunch as to

1 how to fund very important national priorities.

2 Finally, I would question how we even
3 protect ourselves and proceed in the world. Last
4 week on the radio I heard a general in Afghanistan
5 saying that 80 percent of his troops' efforts are on
6 community-building. They are building streets and
7 sewers and things like that. That's what the
8 soldiers are doing, and that's what's working. So I
9 think it's time for a whole reconsideration of how
10 we do deal with the challenges that confront us
11 internationally today.

12 I was sensitive to what was stated earlier
13 about the work at Los Alamos on deterrence, and the
14 suggestion that it feeds off the nuclear weapon
15 production work. And I'd like to propose that the
16 deterrence work at Los Alamos is extremely important
17 and that that could be the leader and be the engine
18 in charge, rather than feeding from the nuclear
19 production, but the deterrence work itself. And
20 along that line, that would further some of the
21 proposals that were put forth in the 2008 January
22 article by Schultz, Perry, Kissinger and Nunn that
23 was alluded to earlier in the presentation.

24 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry, you have got a
25 little less than a minute left.

1 MS. GROSS: Let me briefly say that they
2 have a number of proposals that would be ideal for
3 work at Los Alamos. They recommend accelerating
4 work to provide the highest possible standards of
5 security for nuclear weapons, as well as nuclear
6 materials, everywhere in the world to prevent
7 terrorists from acquiring a nuclear bomb.

8 Number two, accounting for and eventually
9 eliminating smaller and more portable nuclear
10 weapons that are potentially acquisition targets for
11 terrorist groups.

12 Three, strengthen means of monitoring
13 compliance with the nuclear nonproliferation treaty.

14 Four, new monitoring stations to detect
15 nuclear tests in support of the comprehensive test
16 ban treaty.

17 And finally, programs to manage the risks
18 of nuclear fuel cycle within the growing global
19 interest in developing nuclear energy. All those
20 programs which would support the efforts and our
21 specific proposals in the article "Toward a Nuclear
22 Free World" are things that make sense to be done at
23 Los Alamos and would turn and use some of our
24 strengths towards things that would move us towards
25 a safer world. And so I would encourage that

1 development of the program. Thank you very much.

2 MR. BROWN: Geraldine Damato and then
3 Rosalie Scimonelli. Again, let me encourage
4 everybody to try to make succinct statements. We
5 still have a number of people left. I don't like to
6 keep interrupting folks and telling them that they
7 have got a minute left, so if you can try and time
8 it to five minutes or less, it will make everything
9 easier. Thank you.

10 MS. AMATO: Thank you. If there's someone
11 that's signed up after me that would like to speak
12 before me, because I left and came back, feel free
13 to come forward, if you have been waiting longer.

14 I'd like to emphasize that whether we work
15 within federal government or on the outside
16 petitioning agents of the federal government, that
17 we must realize if we study history, this federal
18 government is no longer a lawful government. It's
19 not accountable to the people, and we know that
20 these public hearings are mere rituals, that they
21 will not make any significant change in what
22 decisions are made because the people themselves in
23 this nation do not affect the policy of the federal
24 government.

25 I would like to spend most of my time

1 citing one of the freedom founders of this nation,
2 whom I consider a man of integrity, Patrick Henry.
3 I learned in the public schools that he said, "Give
4 me liberty or give me death," but it wasn't until
5 this past month that I actually read the speech, and
6 you can still find it on the Internet. It's March
7 of 1775. Then there's another speech of June 5,
8 1788, when the federal government's constitution was
9 being sent around to the states and constitutional
10 conventions. He, in Virginia, opposed the adoption
11 of the federal government's constitution.

12 I argue that we are now on a
13 coast-to-coast federal reservation and that's why we
14 call the federal government's constitution the
15 United States constitution. It was only intended to
16 describe the powers, the limited powers, of the
17 federal government. Today we have a central
18 government in Washington, D.C., that's not according
19 to the principles that were laid down by the freedom
20 founders.

21 Just one excerpt from Henry's opposition
22 speech to the adoption of the federal constitution.
23 "It is not a democracy wherein the people retain all
24 their rights securely. Had these principles been
25 adhered to, we should not have been brought to this

1 alarming transition from a confederacy to a
2 consolidated government," meaning a central
3 government in Washington D.C.

4 And then reading from his "Give me liberty
5 or give me death" speech. "We have petitioned, we
6 have remonstrated, we have supplicated, we have
7 prostrated ourselves before the throne and have
8 implored its interposition to arrest the tyrannical
9 hands of the ministry and Parliament. Our petitions
10 have been slighted, our remonstrances have produced
11 additional violence and insult, our supplications
12 have been disregarded, and we have been spurned,
13 with contempt ... In vain, after these things, may
14 we indulge the fond hope of peace and
15 reconciliation. There is no longer any room for
16 hope. If we wish to be free, if we mean to preserve
17 inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we
18 have been so long contending, if we mean not basely
19 to abandon the noble struggle in which we have been
20 so long engaged and which we have pledged ourselves
21 never to abandon until the glorious object of our
22 contest shall be obtained, we must fight. I repeat
23 it, sir, we must fight.

24 "An appeal to arms and to the God of hosts
25 is all that is left us. They tell us, sir, that we

1 are weak, unable to cope with so formidable an
2 adversary. But when shall we be stronger? Will it
3 be the next week or the next year? Will it be when
4 we are totally disarmed and when a British guard
5 shall be stationed in every house? Shall we gather
6 strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we
7 acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying
8 supinely on our backs and hugging the delusive
9 phantom of hope until our enemies shall have bound
10 us hand and foot?

11 "Sir, we are not weak if we make a proper
12 use of those means which the God of nature has
13 placed in our power. Three millions of people,
14 armed in the holy cause of liberty, and in such a
15 country as that which we possess, are invincible by
16 any force which our enemy can send against us.
17 Besides, sir, we shall not fight our battles alone.
18 There is a just God who presides over the destinies
19 of nations, and who will raise up friends to fight
20 our battles for us. The battle, sir, is not to the
21 strong alone. It is to the vigilant, the active,
22 the brave. Besides, sir, we have no election. If
23 we were base enough to desire it, it is now too late
24 to retire from the contest.

25 "There is no retreat but in submission and

1 slavery. Our chains are forged. Their clanking may
2 be heard... It is in vain, sir, to extenuate the
3 matter. Gentlemen may cry, 'Peace, peace,' but
4 there is no peace. The war is actually begun. The
5 next gale that sweeps from the north" --

6 MR. BROWN: Pardon me. I hate to
7 interrupt Patrick Henry, but if you can just
8 conclude this statement, because you're at your time
9 limit.

10 MS. AMATO: "What would they have? Is
11 life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased
12 at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it,
13 Almighty God. I know not what course others may
14 take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me
15 death."

16 And then two sentences from the
17 Declaration of Independence. Our repeated petitions
18 have been answered only by repeated injury. With a
19 firm reliance on the protection of divine
20 providence, we mutually pledge to each other our
21 lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor.

22 MR. BROWN: Rosalie. You're next, and
23 Greg Mello will follow you. Rosalie.

24 MS. SCIMONELLI: Good afternoon. How is
25 everybody today? Cooled down? All right.

1 My name is Rosalie Scimonelli. It is an
2 Italian-Sicilian immigrant name. My grandparents
3 came to this country at the turn of the century at
4 Ellis Island, of which I'm extremely and profoundly
5 proud. They came to America with a hope and a
6 vision, they came with pride, contributing to our
7 civilization. My father served in World War II in
8 the South Pacific. He was missing in action and
9 came home a war hero.

10 The Los Alamos National Laboratory is a
11 national treasure. We need to honor it, we need to
12 support it, and we need to uphold the intelligence
13 of the scientists and the administrators of the
14 laboratories. I beseech you in the name of
15 civilization, honor, and moral righteousness, yes,
16 to dismiss this appalling name-calling, frustration,
17 and anger. I am a devout Catholic that was raised
18 by the Notre Dame nuns in Washington, D.C. We as a
19 Christian nation are morally bound to help and love
20 one another. How are we going to eradicate the
21 problems that this laboratory has inherited with the
22 population as negative as I have heard today?
23 Negative thoughts, actions, accusations, and words
24 will only bring about more negativity in our
25 environment and our families and in our homes.

1 I invite you to sit down with these young,
2 honorably, moral scientists who have dedicated their
3 lives and educations to the pursuit of fixing the
4 problem that they inherited. You talk about money.
5 You talk about homes. Any one of them could leave
6 government service and make ten times more money
7 and -- yes, ma'am. Excuse me. I am speaking.

8 MR. BROWN: Let her finish, please.

9 MS. SCIMONELLI: Yes, please. I sat for
10 almost two hours to listen to you. If you are a
11 student of history, which I am, and Rome flows
12 through my veins, every nation that has lasted has
13 lasted through military might. Yes.

14 MR. BROWN: And you have got a minute left
15 for your statement.

16 MS. SCIMONELLI: What I'm saying is that
17 the Los Alamos National Laboratories have a breed of
18 young scientists that are dedicated to eradicating
19 nuclear weapons by deterrence in our world. If
20 China, Iran, or Korea had the might we had, do you
21 think that they would be Christian toward us? We
22 are more prone to be run over in New Mexico by a
23 drunk driver, gunned down in our schools, than what
24 you are talking about today. If there is pollution
25 in the water, if there is this pit that you think

1 does not need to be repaired, which it absolutely
2 does need to be replaced, we are spending \$12
3 billion a month on the Iraqi war.

4 What we propose for Los Alamos is a
5 pittance. It needs to be maintained, and we should
6 be thanking our scientists for their God-given
7 intelligence. My pat answer to this is: When you
8 get a Ph.D. at the age of 24 from the University of
9 Berkeley as a National Science Foundation fellow in
10 chemical engineering, then you can have an opinion.
11 Thank you.

12 MR. BROWN: Our next speaker actually is
13 Peter Mello. Greg is not here at the moment. So
14 Peter is next. Greg is back? Okay. Then Greg will
15 follow Peter.

16 MR. NELLS: Thank you. It's good to see
17 Ted again. Last time I saw Ted was in his office at
18 the Forrestal Building, and you go through about
19 three layers of security, and then you check your
20 shoes in a locker before you can go see Ted. But
21 he's a good guy. And the study group couldn't do a
22 lot of the work that we do if it weren't for a lot
23 of good people at Los Alamos that we work with.

24 The CMRR is under construction right now,
25 and it's really interesting that the NNSA is telling

1 us now that it's not for pit construction when for
2 the last several years they have insisted they need
3 that building to meet their requirement to produce
4 plutonium pits. So I haven't figured out where that
5 change in posture came from. We're still wrestling
6 with that. But the reality is that infrastructure
7 creates policy.

8 So the real issue here is that these
9 hearings are manipulating the NEPA process to divert
10 your most serious concern harmlessly away from the
11 people who actually make decisions relevant to these
12 programs, which is to say your Congress people and
13 senators. I think that the members of our
14 congressional delegation assumed that we're idiots,
15 and we rarely disappoint them.

16 The debt that Congress is running up for
17 Mr. Bush's war is going to have to be paid someday,
18 and it will be an increasingly difficult economic
19 climate over which we will have diminishing control.
20 Nuclear weapons are a vice we simply can no longer
21 afford. Congressman Udall supported the
22 construction of the new pit factory at Los Alamos at
23 a cost of what's estimated to be \$2 billion, but if
24 other projects at the lab are any indication, it
25 will certainly run nearer to three, three and a half

1 billion.

2 In essence, we build 200 certified pits a
3 year at Pantex at no additional cost to what is
4 already budgeted for dismantlement. Additionally,
5 there's no document or requirement for the NNSA to
6 produce any pits whatsoever, even one per year.
7 There's no requirement. The military doesn't ask
8 for a single pit. Such production can't be
9 demonstrated to contribute in any way to the
10 reliability of the stockpile. Pit production is
11 about new weapons.

12 Mr. Udall wants to convert Los Alamos to
13 another mission. The only way to convert Los Alamos
14 is with a bulldozer. We don't owe a job to the
15 people who chose a lucrative career in nuclear
16 weapons. They can retrain, just like we've told
17 steel workers and garment workers and assembly
18 workers to do when their jobs were shipped overseas
19 thanks to new monetary policies. Yet if Mr. Udall
20 is serious about the conversion, why did he try to
21 restore funding for a new generation of nuclear
22 weapons? This vote compromises nonproliferation
23 efforts and contradicts his stated objective of
24 converging for Los Alamos.

25 We don't, as many well intended people are

1 rushing to suggest, need a Manhattan Project to
2 address the looming energy crisis. Much of the
3 technology already exists. What we need is a new
4 deal for emergency, putting people to work
5 installing concentrating solar and wind, insulating
6 homes and businesses, and freeing from our reliance
7 on fossil fuels. That would be a revolutionary way
8 to spend money.

9 MR. BROWN: You have get a minute left
10 here. Thanks.

11 MR. NELLS: Thank you. There's nothing
12 clean about nuclear power. That lie must be
13 rejected. Nuclear power has been wisely rejected by
14 the private financial sector as being on life
15 support because of our Congressional delegation.
16 It's a black hole for public money. Contrary to
17 what we were once told, nuclear power is not too
18 cheap to meter. It's too costly to matter. Yet our
19 delegation lavishes money on nuclear and energy
20 neutral biofuels supported by robust nuclear lobbies
21 while all but ignoring practical alternatives that
22 could put thousands of people to work and produce
23 thousands of megawatts of electricity before a
24 single nuclear plant is even one-third complete.

25 Senator Bingaman is the chair of the

1 committee that is doing this. The nuclear power
2 industry has been one of his biggest supporters for
3 years. Los Alamos and Sandia should be tasked with
4 actually cleaning up rather than covering up their
5 legacy waste sites. This mission would keep many
6 scientists and technicians busy for the balance of
7 their careers, create many good jobs for workers,
8 and leave the land as we found it instead of the
9 sleeping nightmare it is today: A horrible hidden
10 threat to posterity. Thank you.

11 (A recess was taken from 2:58 to 3:03.)

12 MR. BROWN: If you'll take your seats,
13 we'll resume the hearing. Our next speaker is Greg
14 Mello, and Maria Santelli will follow Greg.

15 MR. MELLO: Thank you all, and thanks to
16 the NNSA team who's come out here on their public
17 road show. I think that maybe my role here might
18 best be to try to get some facts on the table about
19 the centerpiece of this transformation plan, which
20 is primarily about factories for nuclear weapons.
21 The primary factory that this is about is called the
22 CMRR project, Chemistry and Metallurgy Research
23 Replacement facility at Los Alamos. We have a few
24 copies of a paper on this over there, and it's on
25 our web site at www.LASG.org. At the top of the

1 page it says, "Build warhead factories now, worry
2 about weapons policy later: Will Congress take back
3 the reins?" So if you click there, you can get
4 this.

5 The reason why it's important to go over
6 the basics is because after about four years of
7 discussing this facility as a pit production
8 facility, in Washington in all the discussions that
9 we've had, of which there have been dozens with NNSA
10 officials, congressional staff, OMB, many other
11 actors, all of a sudden now, the laboratory in a fit
12 of creative communication is saying that this
13 facility is not about nuclear weapons manufacturing,
14 it's not about plutonium pit manufacturing. It's as
15 if there was a public relations meeting and they
16 said, "Well, what can we do to sell this? We've
17 been shot down in every attempt that we have tried
18 to make to rebuild the nuclear weapons complex,
19 especially Rocky Flats, since 1989. What are we
20 going to do? People don't like nuclear weapons.
21 They don't want plutonium manufacturing. I know.
22 Let's just deny the whole thing."

23 Now, this works pretty well because the
24 news media doesn't have a lot of time and they are
25 under individually some pressure, and it's very

1 confusing to them when people are willing to say
2 things which are just not true, because none of us
3 can live our lives like that. You can't just walk
4 home and, you know, say, "Honey, I bought a new
5 car."

6 "Where is it?"

7 "Well, I don't know."

8 "I can't see it."

9 "It's right there."

10 But this does work in the nuclear weapons
11 complex, because everything is secret. So it
12 becomes possible to raise the bar for understanding
13 so high that even intelligent and conscientious
14 actors can no longer reach it. This kind of
15 deception is what the gentlemen from Los Alamos Labs
16 who were here -- John Ventura and others -- this is
17 the game that they are engaged in here. I'm sorry
18 to be so critical. But we have just really never
19 seen anything like this in the last decade or decade
20 and a half.

21 So if you read The New Mexican today
22 you'll learn that the laboratory says that this is
23 not about pit production, the House Appropriations
24 Committee says proceeding with the CMRR project as
25 currently planned will strongly prejudice any

1 nuclear complex transformation plan, the CMRR
2 facility has no coherent mission to justify it
3 unless the decision is made to begin an aggressive
4 new nuclear warhead design and pit production
5 mission at Los Alamos National Laboratory. The
6 committee is concerned that NNSA is proceeding with
7 large expenditures for this project, while there are
8 significant unresolved issues and recommends fiscal
9 year 2007 funding be held in reserve.

10 MR. BROWN: You have got a minute left for
11 your statement.

12 MR. MELLO: Thank you. So we have a
13 serious factual disconnect here. While we are all
14 pouring our hearts out over here, at least you have
15 been, Glenn Mara, head of nuclear weapons design at
16 Los Alamos National Laboratories, has been over at
17 the Albuquerque Journal meeting with the editors
18 there, and making sure that the uncross-examined,
19 undiluted laboratory perspective is injected in the
20 most powerful place.

21 So as we've been saying to you, folks,
22 these hearings are an opportunity, but they're only
23 an opportunity if we're able to use them as a
24 stepping stone to try to revitalize our
25 representative democracy and not as a place to

1 replace the representative democracy.

2 I see Sarah Cobb is here from Tom Udall's
3 office. Thank you very much, Sarah, for coming.
4 And I encourage everybody to talk to Tom Udall's
5 staff, to Tom Udall himself, to write letters to the
6 editor, to talk to donors and supporters of his
7 campaign, as well as all the other candidates, to
8 let them know that it's not okay to let New Mexico
9 go in this direction, especially as we've now faced,
10 as Peter so well said, converging crises which
11 require our every effort to avoid the worst aspects
12 of. We can't afford to squander more than \$3
13 billion and more than a decade of work on a
14 plutonium factory in New Mexico. If that is where
15 our laboratories go, if that is where the loyalties
16 of our elected representatives go, we won't have the
17 management attention, the political attention, the
18 political will, to address the very serious problems
19 we have. And I'm sure I'm over time. Thank you
20 very much for your patience.

21 MR. BROWN: Thanks. Next is Maria
22 Santelli, and she'll be followed by Marlene
23 Perrotti.

24 MS. SANTELLI: Good afternoon. So complex
25 transformation, or no matter what other euphemism

1 they use, this is about a new generation of nuclear
2 bombs. And if you don't believe all the arguments
3 you have heard today, if you don't believe this is
4 just plain wrong, that this is morally wrong, if
5 your product is a weapon, your market is a war, and
6 that's morally wrong, to be invested in instability
7 in the world, if you don't believe that, if you
8 don't believe that this is going to start a new arms
9 race -- and I think that the example of North Korea
10 is underscored by the examples of the dual illegal
11 occupations and invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan,
12 if you have nuclear weapons, the United States won't
13 attack you. So this could start a new arms race in
14 the world. If you don't believe that nuclear
15 weapons aren't genocidal, as indiscriminate weapons
16 of mass destruction, and if you don't believe that
17 we're violating our obligation to the
18 nonproliferation treaty and breaking international
19 law, then let me introduce something that we haven't
20 really talked about yet today: The legacy and
21 continued contamination that exists at this clean
22 laboratory that does science. Who has heard Los
23 Alamos described as a scientific laboratory? What
24 do they do there? They do science. Have you heard
25 that? Yeah? Come on, you guys. We have heard it.

1 They do science there.

2 Well, the science that they do is nuclear
3 weapons science. That's where the lion's share of
4 the budget goes. The Centers for Disease Control, a
5 federal agency of the United States, the Centers for
6 Disease Control, whose purpose is to protect the
7 public health, have received so many calls from
8 concerned community members across the United States
9 and from New Mexico about health problems in
10 Los Alamos that they initiated a study in 1999 that
11 is ongoing today. It's called the Los Alamos
12 Historical Document Retrieval and Assessment
13 project. LAHDRA.

14 And they have pieced together -- it's
15 ongoing, but they have been piecing together since
16 1999 historical records as well as tissue samples
17 from corpses of folks who worked at the lab or lived
18 near the lab. What they found out is that
19 Los Alamos is the dirtiest of all of the Department
20 of Energy weapons laboratories across the country.
21 And they're not done yet. The laboratory admitted
22 between 1948 and 1973 that they emitted, they
23 admitted that they emitted 1.2 curies of plutonium.
24 A curie.

25 When you're thinking about radiation,

1 measurements, it's hard to conceptualize, so let's
2 look at a curie. A picocurie is one billionth of a
3 curie. A picocurie. That's how you measure
4 background radiation. So picture a picocurie in
5 dollar amounts would be like a burger and a Coke.
6 That's a picocurie. A curie, two times the federal
7 budget. So Los Alamos admits between 1948 and 1973
8 that they emitted 1.2 curies of plutonium.

9 What the CDC uncovered is that between
10 1948 and 1955, seven years, Los Alamos actually
11 emitted 43 curies of plutonium. Who's been to
12 Los Alamos? What do you notice when you go there on
13 the drive, say, from the south and heading up to
14 Los Alamos? What's the road like? What's the
15 terrain like? It glows. Well, it's a mesa.
16 Los Alamos is located on top of a mesa and that was
17 strategic during the Manhattan Project because you
18 could control who was coming up and coming down from
19 the mesa. Not very strategic when you're talking
20 about protecting a major water source.

21 This mesa is at the top of a series of
22 canyons that drain into the Rio Grande. So those 43
23 curies of plutonium -- and only plutonium. They
24 haven't even looked at other contaminants yet in
25 this study that's been ongoing since 1999. 43

1 curies of plutonium into our accessible environment.

2 Also what the CDC study uncovered is that
3 Area G has 100 times the background radiation. Area
4 G is a dump where they dug shallow pits and trenches
5 and dumped for years and continue to dump. It has
6 100 times the background radiation of the
7 environment, of the national environment. And all
8 this is coming downstream. We already know that the
9 wells that feed Santa Fe are contaminated.
10 Albuquerque will be drinking river water shortly, if
11 this project works.

12 I talk to kids from fourth grade all the
13 way up. We draw a map, it's called our nuclear
14 New Mexico, and we follow the pathways of
15 contamination across the map. And at the end of
16 this hour discussion or more with these kids we look
17 at the map and say, "And this agency who brought us
18 this, contamination across the state of New Mexico,
19 wants to come and do more of this." And I ask the
20 young people, "What do you think about that?"

21 And they say, "No."

22 Well, they say it's going to be different
23 this time. It's going to be cleaner this time. And
24 the little kids, fourth graders, are the cutest,
25 they're like, "We won't trust them."

1 Well, New Mexico is approaching the 65th
2 anniversary. Next month, the 65th anniversary of
3 our dysfunctional and abusive relationship with Los
4 Alamos National Laboratory. And if we learned
5 anything we've definitely learned in 65 years one
6 thing we can trust about the Department of Energy
7 and land is that they are not to be trusted. Peace.

8 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay, Marlene
9 Perrotti. And she will be followed by Anita
10 Amstutz.

11 MS. PERROTTI: Good afternoon. I'm
12 Marlene Perrotti. I'm a Sister of Mercy, and I'm
13 also part of the Partnership for Earth Spirituality.
14 I would just like to bring to mind the role of the
15 Department of Energy. The Department of Energy has
16 been entrusted with the mission of providing energy
17 that is going to be safe for its citizenship. And
18 here we are today looking at the environmental
19 review of the proposed restructuring of the national
20 nuclear weapons production, called complex
21 transformation. It is to consolidate current
22 nuclear facilities and increase the production
23 capabilities of material for new nuclear weapons.
24 What this does, this proposal designates LANL as the
25 nation's plutonium pit manufacturing center, so

1 given that context, and understanding that LANL is
2 manufacturing plutonium pits, the highly radioactive
3 coarse of modern nuclear weapons, I would like to
4 look at several areas. One is ethical.

5 One of the first things that we need to do
6 is to understand that we need to honor the 1970s
7 nuclear nonproliferation treaty and dismantle our
8 nuclear stockpile. This proposal is against ethical
9 and legal and moral demands. This does not include
10 increasing production of new nuclear weapons or
11 plutonium pits.

12 The second thing I would like to talk
13 about is an ethical issue, and that is water is
14 life. The Rio Grande is our lifeline. It is
15 finite, and it has a scarcity to it. It runs from
16 Colorado to the Gulf of Mexico, to the states in
17 Mexico. I think we have to look at the ethical
18 dimension of existence as we look at the future.
19 LANL has never dealt responsibly with the
20 radionuclide waste from current or previous bomb
21 making activities. And at present, over 2000 sites
22 on LANL's industrial site have been identified where
23 radioactive contaminants such as tritium, plutonium,
24 americium, cesium, strontium-90, and possibly
25 neptunium have been detected, as well as chemical

1 contaminants such as hexavalent chromium, nickel,
2 high explosive, percolate, pentachlorophenol, and
3 others. I have taken these from some of the issues
4 and pamphlets that have been on, and also from the
5 Journal that came out this past Sunday.

6 The other approach is the subsequent
7 condition. In the newspaper on Sunday it said that
8 the existing CMR is on a seismic place, and that it
9 is unsafe and it cannot contain the radiation. The
10 new building is one mile away, and I cannot believe
11 that something one mile away is going to be seismic
12 safe. So I do think that we need to really look at
13 that seismic issue.

14 MR. BROWN: And you have got a minute
15 remaining.

16 MS. PERROTTI: And the other thing I would
17 like to talk about is the impact with respect to the
18 reconstruction. I really support a mission change
19 for LANL, that it focuses on cleanup, that it
20 focuses on renewable energy, geothermal, and I also
21 think that we should really demand our scientists to
22 be their best selves and that is to protect the
23 commonwealth, for the common good. And with respect
24 to the deterrence, learn and dismantle antinuclear
25 proliferation. I think we have the technology to do

1 that. And I am totally against 60 percent of LANL's
2 budget going for pit production. It has bankrupt
3 the United States, and I think that the only one
4 that's benefiting by it is the defense corporations
5 that are really heading LANL. Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: Anita Amstutz and Mark Rudd.

7 MS. AMSTUTZ: My name is Anita Amstutz,
8 and I am the local minister of the Albuquerque
9 Mennonite Church. I know one of my colleagues spoke
10 earlier, and as he said, we are an historic peace
11 church, but we've often been the quiet in the land,
12 and it is morally unconscionable to be quiet on this
13 issue.

14 We of the community want the labs to be
15 used for something that is about human creativity
16 and ingenuity, in the service of all the
17 possibilities of that which is life-giving, not
18 death-dealing. When I look out over this audience
19 whether you work for Sandia Labs, LANL, whether you
20 are a citizen of Albuquerque, Santa Fe, you all need
21 clean water. You all need pure air to drink. You
22 need natural resources. We are of one mind on that,
23 are we not? And that our next generation and our
24 children's generation will need that also, and it
25 would help our cause a lot more if you guys in the

1 labs would help us out a little bit to work more on
2 things like efficient cookstoves for Chad and Sudan,
3 to perfect solar technology so there is one on every
4 rooftop in New Mexico, so that we have gang members
5 weatherizing low-income and elderly homes. The
6 ideas are endless.

7 I'm afraid our imagination, our souls, and
8 our courage has become small. If you see yourselves
9 as public servants of this generation, be it in
10 service of a path for our children, who are actually
11 disillusioned that their future is meaningful, we
12 must move forward with creative and fearless
13 solutions to poverty, child mortality rates, hunger,
14 natural disasters, and climate change.

15 Now, I'm not saying anything new here,
16 folks. You have all said it brilliantly. I have
17 been so heartened by the articulation and the
18 intelligence of this populace, and I do hope that
19 that does have an impact on the record-keeping here,
20 that this is a populace that is well-educated on
21 these issues. We understand that it's going to be
22 not cost-effective to have a bigger nuclear arsenal,
23 the impacts of toxic water and waste, et cetera, et
24 cetera.

25 I want to just say one last thing which

1 has to do with the colonization of New Mexico, one
2 thing that I haven't heard anybody talk about. If
3 you think about colonization, the great Roman
4 Empire, the great British Empire, and now the great
5 American Empire, it goes into a place and it uses
6 that place as people resources, that place's natural
7 resources, that place's economy for their best
8 interests. And what we have now is a colonization
9 of New Mexico.

10 And as I heard it here today, we are
11 decolonizing our minds and our hearts, and that's
12 what we need to do as a people, is decolonize our
13 heart space and our souls so that we are no longer
14 letting the DOE or anybody else come in and take
15 over our nature resources, our people resources, and
16 our economy, and use it for something that does not
17 get plowed back into our communities.

18 Our communities are not benefiting from
19 nuclear waste or nuclear weapons, are we? How are
20 they benefiting our local economies? We still have
21 one of the highest-ranking -- number 49 -- in terms
22 of low education, the lowest education. The second
23 highest poverty rate in child poverty rate in the
24 nation, ranking 37. Do we understand that most of
25 the money that Pete Domenici has been bringing in

1 does not go into our communities? It goes to
2 overpaid workers and people who work at the economy
3 that we're talking about that is colonizing our
4 communities.

5 So I ask that we do not let this continue
6 on. Nuclear weapons, war violence, and armaments
7 have sprung a leak in our local economy, they are
8 bankrupting our very souls as a people. Instruments
9 of death are a violation of life itself. Nuclear
10 weapons and human security cannot coexist. As a
11 report from the Weapons of Mass Destruction
12 Commission writes, as long as any state has nuclear
13 weapons, others want them.

14 MR. BROWN: One minute left.

15 MS. AMSTUTZ: One minute? As Brazil
16 said -- I love this -- one cannot worship at the
17 altar of nuclear weapons and then raise heresy
18 charges against those who want to join the sect.

19 We are in violation of our treaties today.
20 There's a high risk that these weapons will one day
21 be used by design or by accident and any such use
22 would be catastrophic. I call our officials, our
23 representatives, to a higher standard of that which
24 is live-giving and sustainable for future
25 generations, and if you can not step up to the plate

1 for a cost-effective, sustainable, life-giving
2 future, we ask that you step aside. And we the
3 people will continue the hard work for seven
4 generations hence, because we must become the newly
5 awakened conscience of our public servants.

6 Here's a quote that I cannot tell you
7 exactly which Native American tribe said it, but I
8 have seen it, and it says something like this.
9 "Someday when all the rivers are poisoned, the fish
10 are dead, only then will we realize that we cannot
11 eat money."

12 MR. BROWN: Okay. Mark Rudd is next. And
13 Iris Keltz will follow.

14 MR. RUDD: She's gone.

15 MR. BROWN: Thanks.

16 MR. RUDD: I'd like to speak briefly on
17 the subject of national security. The old concept,
18 the Cold War concept, as I understand it, was that
19 deterrence would come about through mutually assured
20 destruction. And there's a little bit of logic to
21 that, as bizarre as it might seem. The idea that
22 there were two sides that are roughly equal, and if
23 one side breaks the balance, everybody dies. It
24 makes sense in a certain kind of way, although I
25 think that there are probably other solutions to the

1 problem, or there were other solutions.

2 But that is not the situation we have now.

3 Now, we have a claim that these -- we have an
4 unbalanced world in which the United States has
5 enormous military power, and, in fact, we spend much
6 more than the rest of the world put together.

7 That's well known. Los Alamos is part of that
8 effort. Then there are a number of people who are
9 very angry for one reason or another, and many
10 speakers have talked today about the problem of
11 nuclear proliferation. But I want to point out that
12 we no longer live in a balanced world, a balanced
13 Cold War world. This imbalance means that our
14 weapons cause proliferation to continue of weapons.

15 Now, I'd like to bring one story of
16 nuclear proliferation to the discussion today. This
17 comes from Seymour Hirsch in The New Yorker, writing
18 in The New Yorker, after the United States invaded
19 Afghanistan in 2001. He talked about the problem in
20 Pakistan of nuclear security. In fact, he was
21 talking in a series of articles about the problems
22 of intelligence that the United States has in the
23 Middle East and Afghanistan and Pakistan. But the
24 story he told was that the nuclear weapons that the
25 government of Pakistan has -- and they have them, as

1 does India have nuclear weapons -- that these
2 weapons are now under the control of the generals in
3 the Pakistani military. They're at the moment
4 allied with President Musharraf, who came to power
5 through military coup, and is supported by the
6 United States, and supports the United States.
7 However, President Musharraf is in a minority
8 position within his military, such that many
9 elements of the military, many of the generals, are
10 Islamist militants and are anti-American.

11 If President Musharraf falls, these
12 nuclear weapons that Pakistan has, these good
13 nuclear weapons -- the United States has declared
14 them good weapons -- will then fall into the control
15 of the generals. Now, not to worry, because the
16 United States has special operations teams in
17 Pakistan and in the area that are ready to swoop in
18 and take control of these nuclear weapons which
19 might otherwise have gone outside of our dictator's
20 control.

21 MR. BROWN: You have got just a minute.

22 MR. RUDD: There's only one problem. We
23 don't know where the nuclear weapons are. This is
24 an example of the insecurity that comes to us
25 because of the promotion of good nuclear weapons.

1 And I just want to call the weapons-makers among us
2 to this fact, that there's a fallacy at the core of
3 what's happening here.

4 One other thing I want to say is, this is
5 ultimately a political question. The more people we
6 have who are antinuclear, the sooner the nuclear
7 juggernaut will stop. Our failure, those of us who
8 have been at it for 30 or more years, our failure
9 is, we have not yet built a mass movement which will
10 fill this room or fill this building or fill the
11 streets, and that is our failure. Of course, there
12 are certain conditions why that is so, but still,
13 this will ultimately be decided as a political
14 issue, and I think that our work for the rest of our
15 lives, and the work of our children, is to build
16 this political movement that stops this madness.

17 MR. BROWN: The next speaker is Sue
18 Chavez.

19 MS. CHAVEZ: I'd like to say that I do not
20 have a doctorate in chemical engineering or
21 anything, but I do feel entitled to talk as a
22 citizen. Both my parents were killed by the bomb,
23 and I just think it's really ironic that Domenici is
24 now saying that we need a new building for the CMRR
25 because the old one is unsafe. And back in the '50s

1 when my dad was handling radionuclides, they didn't
2 know -- or maybe they were still in denial about how
3 unsafe it is, but now we know, and I would propose
4 that we use all the resources we have to clean up
5 the waste that exists now.

6 Regrettably, I just also want to mention
7 that your insurance and my insurance does not cover
8 us for a nuclear accident. And regrettably, the
9 NNSA is using NEPA, the National Environmental
10 Policy Act, hearings as a shock absorber to deflect
11 citizen concern about a new generation of nuclear
12 weapons away from the people who actually fund these
13 programs. Our congressional delegation reliably
14 funds any lab program, whether it makes sense or
15 not. This absence of critical analysis crosses
16 party lines. No one is immune from responsibility.
17 They like to claim they are supporting jobs for
18 New Mexico, yet none of them have ever expressed
19 interest in funding a thorough study that looks at
20 the opportunity costs of having nuclear weapons
21 dominate our economy.

22 I want to mention I work in the public
23 schools, and if you want job security, become a
24 teacher or become a speech language therapist, like
25 I am. You won't make as much money, but it's really

1 rewarding, and there is work for sure. Very likely,
2 with our attractive climate, New Mexico would enjoy
3 considerable employment diversity and high-quality
4 jobs completely independent of the labs, were they
5 not here. No one has ever looked at this.

6 Congressman Udall claims he wants a new
7 mission for Los Alamos, and he apparently does. He
8 supported a new generation of nuclear weapons last
9 year, the RRW, when even the White House -- the
10 White House, think about who we have in the White
11 House -- had realized Congress was not willing to
12 buy this program. The Senate Energy Committee that
13 Bingaman chairs refuses to aggressively fund
14 existing alternative energy that could free us from
15 our reliance on fossil fuels while wasting tens of
16 billions of dollars on nuclear power which will not
17 come in time to help our energy outlook and will
18 cost more than simpler, less energy-intensive and
19 infinitely safer life-concentrating solar.

20 Pit production at Los Alamos which is
21 neither mandated by any policy directive nor
22 required by any demonstrable need in order to assure
23 the reliability of the stockpile, is actually about
24 nuclear weapons. We do not need to make a single
25 pit, and a new generation of nuclear weapons will

1 diminish, not enhance, our national security.

2 All these aspects of the nuclear cycle --
3 and we know that these aspects are more and more
4 being privatized. It's not a matter of the
5 government. It's a matter of profit for industry.
6 And in particular, any pit production is not in the
7 best interests of New Mexico, and I want our
8 congressional delegation -- and I hope those of you
9 here who are against this pit production, any pit
10 production, will contact your representatives. Let
11 them know that we are paying attention. Thank you.

12 MR. BROWN: The next speaker is Sonny
13 Weakee.

14 MR. WEAKEE: Hello. My name is Sonny
15 Weakee. I come from the Pueblos of Cochiti, Zuni,
16 and I'm half-Dineh, so my people have seen the
17 effects of the uranium. You know, I have heard
18 stories about Cochiti. They can't empty that lake
19 because there's too much uranium in it. If it dries
20 up, it would become airborne. You know, my
21 grandmother had a lot of kids in Cochiti Pueblo.
22 And one of the things that you don't seem to think
23 about is the consequences of these actions. I just
24 heard about this, you know, all the plutonium they
25 let out during World War II. You know, my

1 grandmother has one son left. Within the last ten
2 years, I have lost a lot of relatives to cancer.

3 And I don't know if you ever been -- had,
4 you know, the -- with health care the way it is for
5 Native Americans -- you know, my aunt lived here in
6 Albuquerque, and she had to drive to Santa Fe to get
7 her chemo treatment. And sitting with her, you
8 know, having to ride with her after she got her
9 chemo treatments -- and you can imagine how
10 miserable you are, having to drive another hour
11 back, you know, the consequences of your actions are
12 real. People die because of the products that
13 you're producing.

14 I have another aunt. I sat with her when
15 she was getting her chemo treatments and looked at
16 this liquid that they were putting into her veins
17 and looking at how it was kind of glowing, and they
18 were putting it into her veins. And she would tell
19 me -- she'd be looking at me and she was tough.
20 She'd look at me and she would say, "You know what,
21 this stuff is making my -- I feel like there's sun
22 in my blood. My veins are burning."

23 I had an uncle who also died of cancer.
24 You know, the thing that was uncommon about all of
25 them -- I'm no scientist -- my grandmother's the

1 only one that's still alive. She's still in
2 Cochiti. The only difference was that during World
3 War II, she was in San Diego, making ships. All the
4 kids that were here at home, playing in the river,
5 are all gone. Her last surviving son lives at the
6 bottom of -- in San Ildefonso, where the last fire,
7 you know -- they had a lot of that -- they burned up
8 all the vegetation, and all the soil went into their
9 community. You can imagine all this plutonium and
10 all this waste that's sitting around there.

11 We're talking about people's lives. And
12 you guys are taking it on yourselves. I have an
13 aunt from Navajoland. She died of cancer, as well.
14 You know, they're finding that there's uranium on
15 the fairgrounds in Shiprock, New Mexico, places
16 where my grandparents sold their produce. My
17 grandfather died of cancer. You know, if you want
18 to talk about how safe your products that you're
19 producing are, then you need to think about who's --
20 talking about these places of sacrifice areas, what
21 about people? You know, you're taking uranium from
22 all over the world, from the poorest communities and
23 the people of color communities. You look at the
24 uranium that's coming from Africa and those poor
25 communities, and you think about all those type of

1 things.

2 So you can come over here and tell me that
3 you got a degree or you got a science degree, you
4 know, that this is safer this way, or that kind of
5 stuff. You know, don't tell me about it. Can you
6 bring back all my aunts and uncles that I have lost
7 all in the last ten years? I don't know what it
8 feels like to you, but when you lose one person
9 after another, it hurts.

10 And so when we're coming here and we're
11 telling you about the real consequences of this
12 development, then we're talking about people's
13 lives. So I don't know anymore what you guys think
14 about this, but you all got that uranium that you're
15 talking about. Building that is going to come from
16 my people's lands, and poison my people. So with
17 that, I want to thank you for your time.

18 MR. BROWN: That's our last speaker, and
19 this actually concludes this afternoon meeting. I'd
20 like to thank everybody who came and spoke, and
21 remind you that there is another meeting in the same
22 location this evening. So again, thanks, and we are
23 adjourned.

24 (The hearing concluded at 3:45 p.m.)

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

(6041A) MAS

19 Date taken: March 11, 2008

Proofread by: LR

20

21

22

23

24

25