

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

Complex Transformation
Draft Supplemental Programmatic
Environmental Impact Statement (SPEIS)
Public Hearing
March 12, 2008
Best Western Hilltop-House Hotel
400 Trinity Drive
Los Alamos, New Mexico 87544

REPORTED BY: Jan A. Williams, RPR, CCR 14
Bean & Associates, Inc.
Professional Court Reporting Service
500 Marquette, Northwest, Suite 280
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
(6043A) JAW

1 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.

2 It's now time to receive your formal comments
3 on the Supplemental PEIS. This is your opportunity to
4 give DOE your views on the draft document. The court
5 reporter is ready to transcribe your statements. Let
6 me review a few ground rules for the public comment
7 period.

8 Please step up to the microphone over there,
9 providing your name and an organization or affiliation
10 where that's appropriate. If you have a written
11 version of your statement, please provide a copy to
12 the court reporter after you have completed your
13 remarks.

14 I will call two names at a time, the first of
15 the speaker and the second of the person to follow.
16 In view of the number of folks who have signed up to
17 speak tonight, please confine your statement to three
18 minutes. Try and summarize your statement,
19 recognizing that statements count equally whether they
20 are presented verbally or submitted in another
21 fashion.

22 So to allow everyone who signed up an
23 opportunity to speak in a timely fashion, I'll ask
24 that your remarks be just three minutes. I will let
25 you know when you have a minute remaining.

1 Ted Wyka will be serving as the hearing
2 officer for the Department of Energy during the formal
3 comment period. I would also like to acknowledge the
4 presence of representatives from Congressman Udall's
5 staff who are in the audience.

6 And also if you have a cell phone, please
7 turn it to silence. We had a symphony of cell phone
8 sounds yesterday. And again as a courtesy to the
9 speakers, if you can just turn those down.

10 So with that by way of introduction, let me
11 call on our first speaker. Jeannette Wallace. She
12 will be followed by Mike Anastasio.

13 MS. WALLACE: All right. I do thank all of
14 you for holding the public forums in our state. I
15 thank the audience for being interested enough to
16 attend. My name is Jeannette Wallace, I'm a state
17 representative in New Mexico. My district includes
18 Los Alamos, Santa Fe, and Sandoval Counties.

19 I have served for 18 years and I have also
20 served six years in the Los Alamos County Council.
21 The Los Alamos National Laboratory and Sandia National
22 Laboratory are both important to our state as well as
23 our nation.

24 The economics to our state are easily seen.
25 We provide well paying jobs in Northern New Mexico, we

1 work with the schools of Northern New Mexico to
2 educate all of our children so they may lead a
3 successful life. Los Alamos National Lab has great
4 technological capabilities.

5 We can reduce the nuclear operations
6 footprint. We can reduce the stockpile while
7 enhancing security and readiness. We can use our
8 technology and computer modeling to verify without
9 underground testing.

10 We can be more cost-effective and downsize.
11 However, many of us feel that we do need that
12 infrastructure in place. And that will be very
13 important. We cannot accomplish those things without
14 that infrastructure.

15 We have great scientists here with a great
16 many disciplines. The issues they work on include a
17 broad range of projects. These projects include many
18 spin-offs that take place as a result of something
19 that excites a scientist during a research project.

20 These items include valuable healthcare
21 research, energy security, environmental issues
22 including key climate change issues, technology to
23 solve solutions to complex math, science, and physics
24 problems. These advances have been made possible with
25 LANL technologies and scientific work derived from the

1 national defense and security work. And that we do
2 support that.

3 We urge all of you to listen to those of us
4 who do support the lab. There are many of us. And we
5 urge you to support the lab also. Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: Mike Anastasio is next and Glenn
7 Mara will follow him. If the second name I call can
8 come a bit to the front of the room, that will save
9 some time. Thanks.

10 MR. ANASTASIO: Thank you. I'm Michael
11 Anastasio and I'm the director of the Los Alamos
12 National Laboratory. I encourage the NNSA to adopt in
13 their record of decision the preferred alternative for
14 the Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Impact
15 Statement. I'd like to make two points regarding
16 that.

17 First of all on the national scene, through
18 this record of decision and preferred alternative, it
19 provides the country an opportunity to further bring
20 to the nuclear weapons complex efficiencies and
21 adaptability. These are really important steps to be
22 taking.

23 Through these kinds of steps, we will be able
24 to respond as an enterprise much more quickly to any
25 problems that show up in the stockpile and, hence, our

1 ability to assure this country and all its citizens
2 that we have a deterrent in place will be more
3 effective. And through that the country will be able
4 to further reduce the size of the nuclear weapons
5 stockpile that we have today, a goal that I think we
6 all endorse. So on the national scale, that provides
7 this kind of I think powerful opportunity.

8 The second is for us here in Northern New
9 Mexico and here in Los Alamos, it also is an important
10 step because it reconfirms for all of us that Los
11 Alamos National Laboratory is a national security
12 science laboratory. And what that means is that we
13 will need the very best and brightest of scientists
14 and engineers that continue to be part of our
15 institution so that we can carry out the missions
16 articulated in this preferred alternative.

17 The success of the stockpile stewardship
18 program and its science base has been remarkable over
19 the last more than a decade. And we'll be able to
20 continue that in the future. But because of all the
21 outstanding science and engineering we'll be able to
22 do at this institution well into the future, we'll
23 also be able to use that very same capability to
24 address other national problems the country faces that
25 we all read about in the newspaper, whether it be

1 nonproliferation, new forms of alternate energy,
2 understanding the global climate, and a variety of
3 other things that, in fact, you've seen in the papers
4 in recent days.

5 So again I think this is a really important
6 opportunity for the lab and for the community and for
7 the country. If properly funded, this will provide a
8 stable laboratory and a stable need well into the
9 future. And I encourage again the NNSA to adopt this
10 preferred alternative in their record of decision.
11 Thank you for the opportunity to talk.

12 MR. BROWN: Glenn is next, Ed Grothus will
13 follow.

14 MR. MARA: Can you hear me in the back? My
15 name is Glenn Mara. I'm the principal associate
16 director for nuclear weapons program at Los Alamos
17 National Laboratory. And I'm very pleased to have the
18 opportunity to make a few brief remarks. And the
19 first, of course, is my solid endorsement of the
20 preferred alternative and the recommendation for its
21 adoption, continuing to a record of decision in the
22 near-term future.

23 Let me expand on why. The preferred
24 alternative basically tries to take the teamwork and
25 the integration across the complex, shrink it to a

1 smaller footprint, preserving the centers of
2 excellence, and more importantly preserving the
3 character of the national laboratories including Los
4 Alamos.

5 It's witnessed by, for example, our being a
6 center of excellence for super computing, critical and
7 important to all of the character of the national
8 laboratory and every program we touch. The weapons
9 program per se is about half the lab. The lab has had
10 a richness in diversity of major contributions to many
11 other venues. And that's going to be even more
12 critical in the future as programs change.

13 It's very obvious that the weapons program
14 has been compacting and shrinking and becoming more
15 efficient, while nonproliferation, energy, green
16 technologies, basic science, and biological are
17 growing. And that's an appropriate and proportional
18 response to the national will.

19 Even more important, though, in this
20 preferred alternative is I have a grave
21 responsibility, a serious one to my fellow workers and
22 for the community. And that's to operate safely,
23 securely, with the best scientific tools to enable
24 progress in all of those missions. And the preferred
25 alternative properly funded makes investments

1 particularly in the nuclear infrastructure.

2 We will have the safest, most modern,
3 efficient, smaller footprint. And not only
4 consolidate our operations, but those of our sister
5 laboratory Livermore. That's smart for the future of
6 the country, that's smart for the future of the
7 program, and if properly done again with the proper
8 research and scientific capability, we can do that.

9 That can also be coexistent with a modest pit
10 production role underpinned by that important
11 scientific R&D capability. And that capability means
12 we will have preserved what was lost in '89 when Rocky
13 Flats closed. And that is the capability to
14 demonstrate that, if needed, we will have it.

15 I have said to my own fellow workers that we
16 will not nor will Los Alamos ever turn into a factory.
17 We are first and foremost a national science
18 laboratory.

19 We have a basic scientific underpinning and
20 we will have a PU production capability that can
21 coexist and preserve both the character of the
22 laboratory and meet the national mission and more
23 importantly safely, securely, with the most modern
24 capability that can assure the community, my fellow
25 members on their daily lives, that they are now

1 existing and coexisting with a laboratory that can
2 afford them those assurances always and continually
3 underpinned by that scientific basis.

4 I thank you. Again I endorse wholeheartedly
5 the preferred alternative and recommend that we move
6 to that as quickly as possible. Thank you.

7 MR. BROWN: Jim Hall will follow Ed.

8 MR. GROTHUS: Honorable persons, my name is
9 Edward Bernard Grothus. On March 23rd I will have
10 been in Los Alamos for 59 years. Most of the first 20
11 of those years I worked in group GMX-4 at R site.
12 There we did hydrodynamic implosion studies in order
13 to make better atomic bombs.

14 We successfully reduced the size of bombs by
15 30 times while we increased the nuclear yield by 30
16 times to 475 kilotons of high explosives. One bomb
17 today can destroy all of New York City. The physics
18 package in a bomb today is the size of a bowling ball.

19 You can put eight bombs on a single Trident
20 submarine missile. There are 24 missiles on a Trident
21 submarine and we have 19 Trident submarines with only
22 the Naval arm of the nuclear defense triad.

23 We can lay waste to 3,648 places on earth the
24 size of New York City. There is no cause, no reason
25 sufficient to destroy a single city anywhere on earth.

1 What would be the gain in doing that?

2 This hearing has been called to study the
3 future of the Los Alamos National Laboratory. There
4 is no future in promoting the nuclear business. To
5 promote the building of pits, to promote further
6 plutonium studies, and to do further simulated
7 implosion studies is both unnecessary and unwise.
8 There's no science in this.

9 Los Alamos science should be doing science.
10 To have earned but one Nobel prize in over 60 years is
11 an embarrassment and is positive evidence as to how
12 little science is done in the Los Alamos National
13 Laboratory.

14 What should scientists in the Los Alamos
15 National Laboratory do. Easy and abundant energy
16 sources are what made our country successful for so
17 many. We have had an abundance of wood, coal, gas,
18 and petroleum. The war is now being waged for the
19 control of oil supplies.

20 Finding an energy source for a time when the
21 supply of oil has been depleted is a crucial need.
22 The sun is the only safe nuclear power supply. The
23 site is ideal at 93 million miles, the power output is
24 essentially infinite, the power distribution is
25 everywhere.

1 At 93 million miles there are no nuclear
2 wastes with which to contend. LANL scientists should
3 be assigned to do solar studies. A breathtaking
4 development in the solar energy field would be even
5 more noteworthy than was the successful detonation of
6 the first nuclear bomb.

7 In my judgment man will survive on this
8 planet only if we learn to live with the output of our
9 nuclear sun. I also want to tell you that the world
10 is imperiled by the nuclear bombs already held here
11 and elsewhere. Abolition of nuclear bombs is
12 imperative.

13 By accident or evil intent, humanity can be
14 destroyed. A nuclear Armageddon cannot be permitted
15 to happen. Imagine a nuclear detonation which would
16 make our power distribution system inoperative
17 permanently. Everything stops. Water, food
18 distribution ceases, there is no communicating, panic
19 evolves into absolute chaos. After only a brief time,
20 the living will envy the dead.

21 Humanity dies in this race to oblivion.
22 Everyone dies. What we take for granted today can
23 never be cranked up again. Dear listeners, we cannot
24 take the chance for the demise of humanity on this
25 planet. Abolition is crucial as is the solar

1 breakthrough in LANL for the world.

2 I remind you of a Latin funeral dirge. Dies
3 irae, dies illa, day of wrath, day of mourning.
4 Solvet saeculum in favilla, see fulfilled the prophets'
5 warning. Teste David cum sibylla, heaven and earth in
6 ashes burning.

7 You must take these words to heart and carry
8 them to Washington, to the politicians, to the CEOs of
9 the military industrial complex, and to the civilian
10 leadership. Remind these entities that they die too.
11 There must be a metamorphosis of the ugly worm of war
12 into the beautiful butterfly of peace. There is no
13 security in military might, only in peace. Do unto
14 others as you would have others do unto you.

15 Thank you, that's the end of my official
16 comments. However, I want to point out I brought the
17 scale models of the two monuments. Here in Los Alamos
18 there's a half a dozen glass plaques downtown to
19 commemorate the most significant man-created event in
20 the history of the world. Half a dozen brass plaques.

21 The two monuments are 42 feet tall, each
22 weighs 40 tons. They're at my place of business at
23 The Black Hole. The obelisks stand on doomsday stones
24 and has the story of Los Alamos inscribed in 15
25 languages, Rosetta stones for the nuclear age.

1 No site has been selected yet. I offered
2 them to Los Alamos and Los Alamos has rejected them.
3 So I feel free to erect them or have them erected
4 anywhere on earth. Thank you very much for your
5 attention.

6 MR. BROWN: William Stratton will follow Jim
7 Hall.

8 MR. HALL: Thank you. My name is James Hall,
9 I'm the Los Alamos County Council chair here in Los
10 Alamos. I'd like to read into the record a letter
11 approved by the county council Tuesday night a week
12 ago at our normal meeting.

13 The council voted six to zero to send this
14 letter. I'll read it with my comments.

15 Dear Mr. Wyka: With this letter Los Alamos
16 County submits official comment on the Draft Complex
17 Transformation Supplemental Programmatic Environmental
18 Impact Statement otherwise known as the SPEIS.

19 The Los Alamos County Council endorses the
20 preferred alternative for Los Alamos National
21 Laboratory as described in the SPEIS, section S.3.17.
22 The preferred alternative recognizes and builds upon
23 the unique capabilities and infrastructure that exists
24 at LANL to support current national security policy.

25 Los Alamos County also endorses locating

1 super computing efforts at LANL along with other
2 essential security missions as they both enhance
3 LANL's prospects for continuing its 65 years of
4 contributions to the security of the nation.

5 The letter then goes on to say many of the
6 contributions to the nation arise from LANL's R&D
7 activities in a broad range of programs including
8 nonnuclear defense, nuclear and nonnuclear energy,
9 materials, atmospheric space and geosciences,
10 bioscience and biotechnology, and the environment as
11 evidenced by the prestigious R&D 100 awards, of which
12 LANL receives several each year.

13 Enhancement of these types of endeavors is
14 essential for attracting top scientists and
15 maintaining the scientific health and vitality of the
16 laboratory and the economic health of the region. The
17 Los Alamos County Council, therefore, endorses
18 continuing and strengthening opportunities for this
19 additional research.

20 Los Alamos County hereby expresses its strong
21 support for LANL whose most significant contributions
22 to the nation lie not in the past but in the future.
23 We will continue to review the SPEIS and may make more
24 detailed formal comments to be submitted later in the
25 comment period. Sincerely James Hall, Chair, Los

1 Alamos County Council. Thank you.

2 MR. BROWN: William Stratton will be followed
3 by Paul White.

4 MR. STRATTON: My name is William Stratton,
5 Bill Stratton. I first came in 1948 as a summer
6 student and came back permanently in 1952. I worked
7 in a variety of activities including theoretical
8 weapon design, nuclear energy, critical assemblies,
9 and the rover program. I ended up in reactor safety
10 matters.

11 I would like to comment very briefly on the
12 fact that fission was first discovered in late 1938
13 and explained in January of 1939 and the race was on.
14 Once a scientific discovery like this is made, it
15 cannot be unmade as lots of people seem to think off
16 and on. You cannot put the genie back in the bottle
17 or Pandora back in the box.

18 The first major application of fission
19 because we're in a war was to end World War II. I was
20 benefited personally, but I did not appreciate it at
21 the time. In 1952 I came back and I was actively
22 involved in the things that were going on to counter
23 the obvious threat that was east of Western Europe.

24 What was done in this laboratory I am firmly
25 convinced prevented the occupation of Western Europe

1 by the Soviet Union and it also prevented World War
2 III. These are not trivial accomplishments.

3 I can think of no better place than the
4 United States for the activities that are described in
5 this complex revision than Los Alamos. I believe it
6 should be placed here. Any other place would make
7 nonsense. It is vitally important that the whole
8 sequence of operations from theatrical weapon design
9 to engineering design to metallurgy to chemistry to
10 high explosives and what testing we can do to assure
11 that we have something that will work when we want it
12 to work. I believe it is very important.

13 I was pleased to see that the environmental
14 impact statement includes some discussion of weapon
15 disassembly. The stockpile of the Russians and the
16 stockpile of ours is far, far too large, way too large
17 for any useful purpose. We should work on reducing
18 these. And I believe Los Alamos can take an active
19 part as well as all of the R&D that are connected with
20 things connected with efficient energy. Thank you.

21 MR. BROWN: Paul White will be followed by
22 Jared Dreicer.

23 MR. WHITE: Good evening. I want to speak
24 very briefly in support of the preferred alternative
25 that the Department of Energy and the National Nuclear

1 Security Administration has offered. In particular I
2 want to speak to that part of it that addresses the
3 plutonium capability in the nuclear weapons complex
4 for the future.

5 As a scientist and as a citizen of Los
6 Alamos, I want -- so long as nuclear weapons continue
7 to be required for our national security, I want the
8 expertise for plutonium technology including plutonium
9 science, the assessment of plutonium components in our
10 current stockpile, and fabrication of any future
11 components that our country may need to be in the best
12 possible technical hands. And I believe those hands
13 to lie here in Los Alamos.

14 Sixty-five years ago the very first plutonium
15 components were assembled here in Los Alamos. In the
16 intervening years, the stewardship of this nation's
17 stockpile has been facilitated by the plutonium
18 science developed and maintained here at Los Alamos.

19 The capabilities to fabricate, the
20 capabilities to assess, the capabilities to monitor
21 plutonium, the capabilities to provide appropriate
22 security and management for plutonium and other
23 special nuclear materials had their roots in places
24 like Los Alamos.

25 Now, as the world's circumstances are

1 changing, some of those capabilities are facilitating
2 the draw down of the stockpiles from their peak
3 numbers a number of years ago. Those capabilities
4 include the ability to assess the current condition of
5 the weapons in the stockpile today and the ability to
6 conduct safe and environmentally responsible and
7 secure disassembly and conversion of the plutonium
8 components declared excess to national need.

9 I have lived in Los Alamos for 33 years. I
10 have retired. I intend to stay here for a lot longer.
11 I believe this can and will continue to be one of the
12 best places to live in the country.

13 I believe it would be only fitting that Los
14 Alamos, the first place to assemble nuclear
15 components, would also be the place responsible for
16 the fabrication of any future nuclear components that
17 our country may require. Thank you.

18 MR. BROWN: Jared will be followed by Lee
19 Bernstein.

20 MR. DREICER: I'm Jared Dreicer, I'm here as
21 an individual, although I do work at the Los Alamos
22 National Laboratory. I was born and raised here in
23 Los Alamos and I'm 50 years old. I've been at the lab
24 for 25 of those years.

25 I'm a second generation lab employee, my

1 father worked at the lab in fusion energy research. I
2 am married to a multigenerational Northern New Mexican
3 family that lives in Dixon, New Mexico. And I have
4 come back to raise my family in Los Alamos, New
5 Mexico, because it is a great place to live and work.

6 That aside Los Alamos is the most preeminent
7 scientific institution in the world. We have nuclear
8 weapons, the stockpile is being drawn down, and Los
9 Alamos can contribute through the use of the preferred
10 alternative choices of the super computing capability,
11 the plutonium science and manufacturing capability,
12 and the weapons physics capability to help address
13 some of the most pressing problems that this globe
14 will face in the future.

15 Global climate change will be supported by
16 perhaps the plutonium science and nuclear energy that
17 will result from that, from the super computing
18 capabilities and modeling that will benefit
19 understanding global climate change as a result of
20 fossil fuel burning.

21 The ability for Los Alamos to continue as a
22 great scientific institution has been well supported
23 by the choice of preferred alternative that the NNSA
24 has made. I'm happy to see that alternative choice
25 and I would very much support it. Thank you.

1 MR. BROWN: Lee will be followed by Bart
2 Davis.

3 MR. BERNSTEIN: I'm just going to read an
4 excerpt from a letter that was prepared and you
5 received a copy of this. My name is Lee Bernstein and
6 I am the president of the New Mexico chapter of the
7 Energy, Technology, and Environmental Business
8 Association. We are an organization of over 180 large
9 as well as small businesses that provide technical
10 services to the NNSA and the DOE complexes across this
11 country.

12 Needless to say, this issue is quite
13 important to probably 75,000 people that we represent.
14 And I don't have this memorized and I was given this
15 to read so excuse me. The Energy, Technology, and
16 Environmental Business Association, we call it ETEBA,
17 represents more than 180 businesses.

18 ETEBA responds to the NNSA SPEIS in support
19 of the preferred alternative for distributed centers
20 of excellence. The draft plan embraces the notion of
21 modern centers of excellence by focusing on core
22 competencies of the various NNSA sites eliminating
23 redundancies and maximizing the consolidation of
24 special nuclear materials.

25 This preferred alternative will help the

1 nation achieve a more effective yet less expensive
2 nuclear security program that meets national security
3 needs. The preferred plan would also establish Y-12
4 as the center of excellence in uranium, Los Alamos as
5 the center of excellence in plutonium.

6 Y-12 and LANL have historically played
7 important roles in the NNSA mission, each having over
8 60 years of expertise in uranium and plutonium
9 technologies. The employees at these sites have
10 irreplaceable institutional knowledge that will be
11 more fully leveraged by modernizing the facilities to
12 enhance productivity, lower operating costs, and
13 improve war conditions, overall safety and security.

14 In addition, these NNSA facilities play a
15 unique role in the economies of our communities in
16 which we are located. We employ large numbers of
17 skilled laborers and professionals while offering
18 better than average salaries and benefits. The letter
19 has been sent to you. Thank you.

20 MR. BROWN: Mary Hockaday will follow Bart.
21 And if the folks are unable to hear some of the
22 speakers and we need to adjust the mike, just raise
23 your hand and we'll take care of that. Thanks.

24 MR. DAVIS: Good evening, everyone. My name
25 is Bart Davis, I work for a local construction

1 contractor here in Los Alamos. We've been performing
2 work for primarily LANL over the last 11 years up
3 here. And I wanted to speak in favor of the preferred
4 alternative.

5 Man, what a -- it looks to me like it's the
6 full package. We're reducing the footprint of our
7 nuclear weapons arsenals and communities, we're --
8 man, it's just everything that we need it looks like.
9 I can't see any downsides to it.

10 LANL has been a tremendous economic engine
11 for New Mexico. I have some figures here. They
12 employ 11,800 people in New Mexico. Salaries, 1.15
13 billion per year. In fiscal year 2006, LANL purchased
14 \$495 million worth of goods and services in New
15 Mexico.

16 The LANL employee scholarship fund through
17 contribution from LANL employees has collected 1.5
18 million in scholarships. LANL employee donations last
19 year totaled more than \$830,000. I think that's
20 phenomenal, the economic impact that LANL has had.

21 So anyway just as a citizen, a community
22 member, I would like you to know that I support the
23 preferred alternative and thank you for having me
24 tonight.

25 MR. BROWN: Mary is next. The printing

1 wasn't quite clear on this. The last name I think is
2 Leoasure, Craig Leoasure. Anyway you can help us out
3 when you get here. Mary.

4 MS. HOCKADAY: I'm Mary Hockaday and I'm the
5 deputy associate director for weapons physics. And
6 I'm speaking in support of the PEIS. I want to let
7 you know I came to New Mexico and LANL at the same
8 time. And that was after I graduated from of all
9 places the University of Hawaii.

10 And people wonder why do I come to New
11 Mexico. And the reason is Los Alamos National
12 Laboratory. Why? Because I had the opportunity to do
13 state-of-the-art science with a very strong mission
14 which was very important to me and I believe very
15 important to most of the people who work at Los Alamos
16 National Laboratory.

17 I believe there are at least two parts of
18 nuclear deterrents. A strong production complex and a
19 science base with both an open and classified
20 component. You need both pieces. Most people don't
21 understand why you need both open and classified
22 research.

23 But I'll tell you, it is the open research
24 that there's competency that we showed the nation and
25 the world in our open research is what scares the

1 bejeebers out of our enemies or thinking about wanting
2 to be our enemy. Just remember that.

3 The PEIS addresses the need in both cases,
4 both for a robust production complex giving us the
5 minimum footprint and making our production complex
6 what we need it to be and also recognizes the role of
7 science. But it could use some improvement.

8 First of all I'd like to say that the PEIS I
9 thought was very encouraging that the NNSA recognized
10 the importance of this connection with science and
11 production by bringing together both plutonium science
12 and pit manufacturing. It's the right thing to do.

13 LANL and the nation needs more than that to
14 be successful in its mission of defense as well as in
15 other areas of research. And I want to make sure that
16 in all the goings-on and all the input that you get,
17 that you don't lose sight of some of the other things
18 that people might just ignore.

19 One is ability to do high explosive and HE
20 driven experiments, making sure that LANL has access
21 to all the different centers of excellence, and the
22 ability to attract excellent scientists in open and
23 classified research, not losing sight of the next
24 generation scientific facilities that we need such as
25 Marie.

1 As comments are assimilated in the PEIS
2 process, I want to make sure that you don't lose sight
3 of that. And I thank you for this opportunity to
4 speak.

5 MR. BROWN: Craig will be followed by Debra
6 Johnson.

7 MR. LEOASURE: Good evening. My name is
8 Craig Leasure, I'm the deputy associate director for
9 weapons engineering at Los Alamos. I'm here tonight
10 as a private citizen. I think that the preferred
11 alternative is a good plan. I think it's something
12 that we should go forward with.

13 I urge the department to put it into the
14 record of decision. I came to the laboratory 18 years
15 ago much like Mary. Coming out of graduate school, I
16 went to work for a private company. I worked in the
17 aerospace business for a number of years.

18 I came here awhile back because this is the
19 place where you can do the best science, the best
20 engineering, and it's a mission that's important to
21 the country. And I strongly believe that, I believed
22 it then, I believe it now.

23 So let me reiterate, I believe that the
24 preferred alternative needs to be put forward as the
25 record of decision and I urge the department to do

1 that. Thank you.

2 MR. BROWN: Debra is next. Johnnie Martinez
3 will follow Debra.

4 DR. JOHNSON: Hi. I'm Dr. Debra Johnson.
5 Los Alamos made me the doctor. I've studied plutonium
6 oxidation ethanol research. This is the place to be.
7 I came to Los Alamos by choice. I could have followed
8 my husband, but I came here because I wanted to.

9 The other thing about this place is that
10 there's so much fascinating work, science,
11 manufacturing. Guess what? I'm a plutonium worker.
12 I've got my hands in the gloves every day that I want
13 to.

14 But the fact is I've been on the committees
15 for the new technology, I've been on the committees
16 making these decisions. This is the best alternative.
17 We have to consolidate so that we can better engineer
18 tomorrow. I've worked on the remediation of waste,
19 I've worked on reducing our footprint. This is where
20 it is. Nobody else is doing it as well as we are.

21 We're making strides within the limits of
22 regulations, safety, and security. I'm committed
23 daily to being here. Please consider this my
24 recommendation for this alternative.

25 MR. BROWN: Cheryl Rofer will follow.

1 MR. MARTINEZ: Good evening. My name is
2 Johnnie Martinez and I'm proud to say I've been an
3 employee at the Los Alamos National Laboratory for
4 about 33 years. Norris Bradbury, the second director
5 of what was then known as the Los Alamos Scientific
6 Laboratory once said the whole object of making these
7 weapons is not to kill people but to find time for
8 somebody to find other ways to solve these problems.

9 That statement was made many years ago when
10 the planet was embroiled in what came to be known as
11 the Cold War. And nuclear weapons designed at Los
12 Alamos did indeed force the powers involved in that
13 war to resolve their deep-seated differences by other
14 means.

15 I believe the proof of this can be found in
16 the deadly but nonetheless limited scale non-nuclear
17 military complex that have occurred since 1945. That
18 was the year that two nuclear weapons showed the world
19 the horrible consequences of their employment. Today
20 nuclear weapons designed and maintained by the Los
21 Alamos National Laboratory continue to provide the
22 time we still seem to need to solve our differences by
23 other means.

24 As a laboratory employee for 33 years, I have
25 become confident and I remain confident that the

1 people and resources of this great laboratory can meet
2 our nation's security needs safely, securely, and
3 conscientiously.

4 I firmly believe that the new
5 responsibilities proposed for the laboratory by the
6 National Nuclear Security Administration will enable
7 the laboratory to build upon its science and
8 technology strengths to further increase its
9 effectiveness in support of this critical security
10 mission.

11 For 65 years we've repeatedly renewed
12 ourselves to meet changing national security needs and
13 I believe we can do so again. As a father and
14 grandfather, I also remain hopeful that the terrible
15 protection afforded by nuclear weapons will continue
16 to force us and the policymakers who represent us to
17 find other ways to solve these problems. Thank you.

18 MR. BROWN: Cheryl will be followed by Susan
19 Gordon.

20 MS. ROFER: I am Sheryl Rofer and I am the
21 president of the Los Alamos Committee on Arms Control
22 and International Security. Our membership includes
23 current and former members of the Los Alamos National
24 Laboratory.

25 The Los Alamos Committee on Arms Control and

1 International Security believes that the total number
2 of U.S. nuclear weapons should be in the range of 200
3 to 300, with the equivalent reductions negotiated for
4 Russia and other nuclear nations. Once this level is
5 reached, further reductions may well be possible.

6 Overall the number of nuclear weapons in the
7 world has been decreasing for several decades and can
8 be expected to decrease further in the future. The
9 plutonium components of a stockpile of a few hundred
10 nuclear weapons can be maintained within today's
11 operational capacity at TA-55, particularly with the
12 addition of the CMR replacement building.

13 If a decision is taken to produce a new
14 robust replacement warhead, it may be desirable to
15 rework pits at a higher rate. However, a stockpile of
16 200 to 300 could be replaced in ten years with rework
17 of 20 to 30 a year. Again such levels should be
18 attainable at the Los Alamos plutonium complex.

19 Nonproliferation programs at Los Alamos and
20 across the complex should be continued at least at
21 present funding levels or increased. Such programs
22 help to prove to the world that the United States is
23 following its obligations under the nuclear
24 nonproliferation treaty and other arms control
25 treaties. Thank you for this opportunity.

1 MR. BROWN: Tom Stark will be next after
2 Susan.

3 MS. GORDON: My name is Susan Gordon and I'm
4 the director of the Alliance For Nuclear
5 Accountability which is a 20-year-old national network
6 representing communities that live downwind and
7 downstream from the Department of Energy's nuclear
8 weapons complex sites. These are very much impacted
9 communities and include many workers from the sites
10 across the country.

11 I want to thank Ted Wyka for ensuring that
12 all the documents for the draft SPEIS were posted on
13 the web. For those of us who spend hours reading
14 them, it's good to have them there. So thank you.

15 I do want to point out two things in your
16 presentation earlier. That in the map that showed the
17 14 sites going down to what you said were seven sites,
18 it fails to mention that the Kansas City site is very
19 much a part of the nuclear weapons complex.

20 It's been cut out of the Supplemental
21 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement and yet it
22 was very much a part of the original 1996 record of
23 decision. And I think that that is a failing of this
24 particular document.

25 The second thing I want to point out from the

1 slide is that at one point during the height of
2 production of nuclear weapons in this country, there
3 were more than 600 sites across this country that were
4 involved in nuclear weapons production. Now, they
5 were not all carrying nuclear materials, they were not
6 all contaminated at the same level.

7 But to imply that going from 14 sites down to
8 seven which is really eight is failing to recognize
9 that those sites exist, those sites have communities
10 next to them, and the cleanup is going to go on for
11 billions of dollars and decades into the future. We
12 have not -- those sites have not disappeared despite
13 the map.

14 And I want to address what I believe is a
15 reasonable alternative to the preferred alternatives
16 that have been listed. And this comes from George
17 Schultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nunn
18 who have outlined eight steps toward a nuclear free
19 world.

20 I'm reading from their editorial that was in
21 the Wall Street Journal in January. Accelerating
22 spread of nuclear weapons, nuclear know-how, and
23 nuclear material has brought us to a nuclear tipping
24 point. We face a very real possibility that the
25 deadliest weapons ever invented could fall into

1 dangerous hands.

2 The steps we are taking now to address these
3 threats are not adequate to the danger, with nuclear
4 weapons more widely available, to try and --
5 decreasingly effective and increasingly hazardous.

6 One year ago, in an essay in this paper, we
7 called for a global effort to reduce reliance on
8 nuclear weapons to prevent the spread into potentially
9 dangerous hands and ultimately to end them as a threat
10 to the world.

11 The interest, momentum, and growing political
12 space that has been created to address these issues
13 over the past year has been extraordinary, with strong
14 positive responses from people all over the world.
15 And in the interest of time I'm going to skip large
16 sections of it.

17 But just to say that Mikhail Gorbachev
18 endorsed it. His quote was it is becoming clear that
19 nuclear weapons are no longer a means of achieving
20 security. In fact, with every passing year, they make
21 our security more precarious.

22 In June the United Kingdom's former
23 secretary, Margaret Thatcher, signaled her
24 government's support, stating what we need is both a
25 vision, a scenario for a world free of nuclear

1 weapons, and action, progressive steps to reduce
2 warhead numbers, and to limit the role of nuclear
3 weapons and security policy.

4 These two strands are separate, but they are
5 mutually reinforcing. Both are necessary but at the
6 moment too weak. There was a meeting last year with
7 the Hoover Institute and the Nuclear Threat Initiative
8 to line out the eight steps that are included in their
9 editorial. And just last month in Norway there was an
10 international meeting gathering scientists from around
11 the world to address this issue.

12 So I hope that NNSA will consider this
13 recommendation that comes not just from radical
14 lefties and peacniks but from conservative military
15 leaders not only in our country but around the world
16 who are saying that it's time to stop this craziness.
17 Thank you.

18 MR. BROWN: Sue Seestrom will follow Tom
19 Stark.

20 MR. STARK: My name is Tom Stark, I work in
21 the environmental cleanup program at Los Alamos and
22 have been an employee for about 27 years. And I thank
23 you for the opportunity to be able to speak on the
24 supplemental to the Programmatic PEIS.

25 One of the things I found most important was

1 when Deputy NNSA Administrator Smolen made the point
2 about building down the stockpile. I'm proud of what
3 Los Alamos has accomplished in supporting national
4 security and the DOE complex as a whole but especially
5 proud to see the stockpile be built down.

6 I believe that the Programmatic EIS, the
7 preferred alternative selected for complex
8 transformation, is the best option to continue to
9 create the opportunity to build down that stockpile to
10 whatever the right level may be.

11 And I think to accomplish that what's most
12 important is to be able to maintain the capability to
13 support nuclear weapons. I think maintaining that
14 capability includes building them, maintaining them,
15 monitoring them, and especially should any
16 difficulties arise being able to correct those
17 difficulties confidently.

18 I think that can only happen if we have the
19 facilities, the tools, but most important the people,
20 the experienced technical people and support people
21 who know how to make those systems work and how to fix
22 whatever may arise in the future.

23 I think the preferred alternative is the best
24 way of being able to provide that capability in
25 support of the nation and really in support of world

1 peace long term. Thank you.

2 MR. BROWN: Astrid Webster will be next.

3 MS. SEESTROM: My name is Susan Seestrom, I'm
4 an employee of Los Alamos National Laboratory, and
5 I've been a resident of Los Alamos County since 1980.

6 I've raised two daughters here in Los Alamos.
7 I'm presently the associate director for experimental
8 physical sciences in Los Alamos. I'm here to speak in
9 support of the NNSA plans for Los Alamos articulated
10 in the preferred alternative to the restructuring of
11 the nuclear weapons complex.

12 The state-of-the-art facilities that will be
13 provided in Los Alamos as part of this plan will allow
14 us to provide capability to make plutonium pits in a
15 way that is safer, environmentally responsible, more
16 secure, and more efficient than we can do in our
17 present aging facilities.

18 I'm convinced that the capabilities provided
19 in the CMRR, in the refurbished Los Alamos Neutron
20 Science Center, and in the Marie Facility will allow a
21 broad range of diverse research extending from
22 material science in support of energy programs as well
23 as stockpile stewardship research and condensed matter
24 physics and high temperature superconductivity and
25 study into the most basic interactions between atomic

1 and nuclear.

2 The NNSA plans for high performance computing
3 will allow thriving research in theory simulation and
4 computer science. I'm convinced that the plans NNSA
5 has on the table will allow Los Alamos to be the
6 exciting center for world class research that brought
7 me to Los Alamos as a graduate student over 30 years
8 ago to earn my Ph.D. in a facility that my friend Lou
9 Rosen built. And so I encourage you to support the
10 alternative presented by the NNSA. Thank you for your
11 attention.

12 MR. BROWN: Astrid, why don't you have your
13 statement and then we'll take a break after your
14 statement.

15 MS. WEBSTER: My name is Astrid Webster, I
16 came up from Albuquerque. And I'm a volunteer for the
17 Los Alamos Study Group. And I would like to know who
18 in the audience is representing our elected officials
19 at the national level, either Tom Udall, Jeff
20 Bingaman, Heather Wilson, or Senator Domenici?

21 Somebody way back there. Okay. All right.
22 A couple of people. Thank you. I would particularly
23 like to address my comments to you. And the reason
24 for that is in Albuquerque we hear a lot about change
25 of mission in Los Alamos. And I think I've heard a

1 lot here tonight that causes me to make some decisions
2 about that.

3 When I attended the previous round of
4 hearings about new -- it was called Complex 2030 then,
5 I went to four out of five of these hearings. I
6 literally heard hundreds of people ask for a no-build
7 option. I'm not hearing anything about that. And
8 again this was a year and a half ago.

9 Please, please, please pay attention to the
10 environment. It is in a critical place. And what
11 I've heard here tonight is pretty much to a person
12 it's believed that the way we make this planet safe is
13 by building more radioactive nuclear weapons, more
14 waste, something that will never, ever be cleaned up.

15 I don't let my grandkids write on the walls
16 because it's hard to clean up. And you guys are
17 poisoning the environment for thousands of years. I
18 wish we could send you all someplace where you could
19 do this safely and not cost us the money that can go
20 for clean renewable energy and for saving the people
21 of New Orleans and things like that, because I would
22 like to live on a humane planet.

23 And I think we should not build a CMRR, I
24 think we should not build a single new weapon because
25 it's against the law, it's in violation of the NPT

1 which we ratified and is now part of our Constitution.

2 I think that the people who represent us in
3 Congress need to understand what you have is an
4 incorrigible affliction. And I don't think it's going
5 to change. And I would like a lot of people to stand
6 up and say this whole country needs a change of
7 direction. Thank you.

8 MR. BROWN: We'll take a five-minute break at
9 this point and resume with Ken Milder is next and then
10 Liviu Popa-Simil.

11 (Break.)

12 MR. BROWN: Let me call our next speaker, Ken
13 Milder.

14 MR. MILDER: I'm Ken Milder, I've been at the
15 lab for only 34 years. So not too long. I'm actually
16 going to speak to the content of the EIS. I'm not
17 sure anyone has done that. But a lot of times the
18 devil is in the details. And I'm doing this because I
19 support the alternative that is being proposed, but I
20 didn't see a lot of references or at least details to
21 these items.

22 If one looks at this graphic, it's clear that
23 programmatic activities at the laboratory and the
24 other laboratories are going to be increasing. So the
25 implication here is that programs will be lost and

1 perhaps others gained as there is consolidation.

2 But the bottom line is there's going to be
3 jobs lost. And if an activity is transferred from one
4 laboratory to another and an employee wants to stay in
5 those fields, that they may have to let's say either
6 leave Los Alamos to go to Livermore or wherever things
7 are going to be transferred and employees at other
8 labs may need to come here.

9 The bottom line is there's going to be a
10 disruption in the region, a disruption in the
11 community. And the socioeconomic element of this EIS
12 I don't feel is complete unless we have more detail on
13 how this will impact the region and the communities
14 for each of these alternatives.

15 I haven't seen that detail yet. You know,
16 there will be impact not only on housing, schools, and
17 services, but, you know, just in families and the
18 upheavals.

19 The other concern, and I didn't see much
20 detail in the EIS on this, that I would like to see
21 more is how under these alternatives are we going to
22 address the impact on recruitment, training,
23 developing skills, expertise, and experience.

24 You know, there's nothing more important in
25 how are we going to retain these -- these young new,

1 the best and the brightest as the director has
2 mentioned. How are we going to recruit them and
3 retain them.

4 The director spoke about using the
5 capabilities for other national initiatives. However,
6 I haven't seen anything on the table. And I haven't
7 seen any programs identified or funded. So there's
8 going to be a transition period during this
9 transformation.

10 So how long will this transition take? We
11 need help in our region and our communities to be able
12 to address all the upheaval and the disruption during
13 this transition. The EIS hadn't -- at least I haven't
14 seen where the EIS adequately addresses those
15 particular issues. And I'd like to see that
16 strengthened in the EIS.

17 The bottom line, though, is I am a member of
18 the county council here, but I'm speaking for myself
19 as a citizen. But I am concerned about how we're
20 going to address these issues. Thank you.

21 MR. BROWN: Liviu Popa-Simil. Is she here?
22 I'll get back to her if she happens to be absent at
23 this point. Shannyn Sollitt. And Mary Nev will be
24 next.

25 MS. SOLLITT: Hello, my name is Shannyn

1 Sollitt, I live in Santa Fe, New Mexico. I'd like to
2 thank Mr. Wyka for allowing this moment for me to come
3 as a downwinder and downstreamer from Los Alamos to
4 address the Los Alamos community here.

5 I am part of an idea called the Los Alamos
6 Peace Project which is to transform the laboratories
7 of weapons of mass destruction into institutions that
8 engage in only life affirming research and
9 development. So one could say that I'm working for
10 the lab.

11 And I come here -- it's a little frightening
12 to come into this room of people who seem to really be
13 in a place where they're advocating creating these
14 weapons and creating death in the world. And I don't
15 know if you really have an awareness, which you
16 should, if I believe that you're -- most of you are
17 scientists here, that what you are creating up here in
18 terms of our environment is, you know, the high point
19 of our bioregion.

20 So, you know, what is being created here is
21 going downstream and downwind. And it's unfathomable
22 for the people that live in that area that you can be
23 thinking of creating more weapons, more waste in
24 this -- you know, what isn't really the alternative
25 that we would like to see presented which is a

1 no-weapons alternative.

2 So I know that you all believe here that you
3 are, you know, protecting our country. But actually
4 what you are doing up here from the perspective of the
5 folks downwind and downstream and, you know, who care
6 for true peace in the world is that you are creating
7 more proliferation of nuclear weapons and thereby
8 creating a more dangerous situation in the world than
9 we already have.

10 And so that's a really -- is very frightening
11 for me to be listening to all of you scientists get up
12 and speak about how you really feel that you're
13 creating more safety in the world when you're really
14 creating more danger by these activities.

15 We're holding the vision down that the
16 scientists here at the national laboratories are going
17 to be addressing the problems of the contamination and
18 using their physics to figure out how to remediate the
19 radioactive waste that you have created here. You
20 know, we're drinking plutonium and tritium and cesium
21 and all of these radionuclides in Santa Fe. And so it
22 makes us not really like you.

23 And we want to like you, we want to have a
24 unified state, we have to have a position where we
25 don't feel like the people up on the hill are trying

1 to destroy our state and also our country. And I
2 realize that's a political question, but this is
3 really, you know, where we're coming from.

4 And I just wanted to say that I went on the
5 web site to look at the cancer in Los Alamos. And I
6 discovered that there was significant elevation over
7 New Mexico of melanoma, non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, ovary,
8 prostate, testes, and breast cancer here in Los
9 Alamos.

10 Now, I don't know if you guys want to look at
11 that kind of thing, but do you want to have a
12 community that creates cancers for the people who are
13 living here? And it's kind of interesting to note
14 that many of these cancers are the reproductive
15 cancers which are indicating to me in a spiritual
16 plane that maybe you shouldn't be reproducing children
17 here.

18 But also I come up here and I care about
19 children, I do a peace project for children. And I've
20 met the children here, I've come to the high school.
21 You've got really fabulous, beautiful, wonderful,
22 creative children here. And the suicide rate in the
23 teens is the highest in New Mexico. There's one out
24 of every two -- I mean every month there's two
25 attempts at teen suicide.

1 I'm getting a little over the top on this.
2 But, you know, please consider these things when
3 you're thinking of creating more weapons of mass
4 destruction for the world. We don't need them, we
5 have plenty. It's like idiocy, to turn in an old
6 nuclear weapon and build a new one. They work
7 perfectly. Thank you.

8 MS. NEV: My name is Mary Nev and I came to
9 Los Alamos because it's both the best place to do
10 science as well as the best place I believe to live in
11 the mountain west. And I was drawn here for both of
12 those reasons.

13 I'm currently the associate director for
14 chemistry, bioscience, earth, and environmental
15 science. And I endorse the complex transformation
16 because I believe that these capabilities that are
17 developed through this proposal are vital for a
18 nuclear weapons manufacturing that is necessary for
19 national and global security. And that they're also
20 crucial for weapons disassembly and stockpile
21 reduction which are activities currently going on at
22 the laboratory.

23 These capabilities that are enhanced through
24 this refurbishment of the facilities and equipment of
25 chemistry, material science, and super computing are

1 also applicable to improving and increasing our energy
2 supply, reducing the impact of different energy
3 alternatives, and providing other kinds of
4 technologies such as advanced isotope science
5 including the development of new radiopharmaceuticals
6 for medical imaging and medical therapies.

7 Additionally these capabilities underpin the
8 entire laboratory which allows for the advancement of
9 capabilities such as biosciences and geosciences that
10 have really been important for the laboratory
11 throughout its history. And they're currently being
12 used to improve human health and to address and
13 understand global climate change.

14 And finally as a citizen I support the
15 decision of the complex modernization and the
16 modernization of the equipment because I believe it
17 will reduce the complex-wide footprint for our nation.
18 And as a mother and a homeowner in Northern New
19 Mexico, I also believe that we can reduce the
20 environmental impact through modernizing our
21 facilities. Thank you.

22 MR. BROWN: John Balog. Is he here? Greg
23 Mello. John is here and then Greg.

24 MR. BALOG: Yes, my name is John Balog, I was
25 born and raised in Los Alamos. My parents came

1 back -- came into Los Alamos in 1955.

2 I have decided to stay in Los Alamos. I've
3 worked at the laboratory now for upwards of 26 years.
4 I have seen many changes in the laboratory, I've also
5 seen many changes in the world. The changes in the
6 world have been a part of what Los Alamos does.

7 We have kept peace in most cases, we have not
8 had to use the weapons that we produce. I think the
9 laboratory is an integral part of Northern New Mexico.
10 It's maintained a high level of students and teaching
11 and a lot of people that have, you know, intelligence
12 have been brought up in this part of the country.

13 I support the preferred alternative. And I
14 believe that by shrinking the laboratory, it's also
15 going to help our safety and security issues. And I
16 think it will be still very, very good for Northern
17 New Mexico and what this weapons lab does for us.

18 Thank you.

19 MR. BROWN: Greg Mello. Cedric Page is after
20 Greg.

21 MR. MELLO: Hello. My name is Greg Mello,
22 I'm with the Los Alamos Study Group. One of the first
23 things that one notices on an evening like this is
24 that most of the testimony is quite vague. Everyone
25 supports the preferred alternative. I'm not sure that

1 there's complete clarity about just what that is. So
2 I'm very sympathetic with what Ken Milder said about
3 the specifics of the proposal.

4 I've been working on these issues now for
5 about 18 years. I think that the core of this
6 proposal lies in the provision of responsive
7 infrastructure for the manufacture of nuclear weapons,
8 particularly for the manufacture of plutonium pits.

9 Pit production is the rate determining step
10 in the production of new nuclear weapons at this time.
11 The central core of this issue is what might be called
12 the CMRR complex, Chemistry and Metallurgy Research
13 Replacement facility complex, including the height of
14 the perimeter fence, the TA-55 reinvestment project,
15 the pit radiography facility, and some other ancillary
16 facilities.

17 This is a \$3 billion effort. The life cycle
18 costs of these facilities are going to be in the \$20
19 billion range. So it's a fairly major national
20 investment, it has very significant impacts on nuclear
21 weapons policy.

22 As Linton Brooks said, I can change nuclear
23 weapons policy in a day, but it takes decades to build
24 infrastructure. So thanks to Joe Martz and many other
25 people, we now know that we don't -- that the pits

1 that would be made that need not -- the only pits we
2 need make over the lifetime of these proposed
3 facilities are novel pits that are not currently in
4 the arsenal. The Bush Administration stockpile plan
5 results in a surfeit of pits in every category except
6 the W88.

7 Now, why are we doing this? General Chilton
8 said on March 6, quote, what we need is a modernized
9 nuclear weapon to go with our modernized delivery
10 platforms that we have worked on and are working on
11 and a responsive infrastructure, one that can produce
12 weapons.

13 These capital plans are not necessary to
14 maintain a nuclear deterrent of arbitrary size for an
15 essentially arbitrary period. They are necessary only
16 to manufacture novel nuclear explosives. Some here
17 may think that they are nice to have. And I guess if
18 I was in the plutonium business, I would think so too.

19 Many people feel it's necessary to replace
20 the 500,000-square-foot CMR building with a
21 400,000-square-foot CMRR project. And I think that
22 what we need to do is look at the missions of the
23 laboratory as a whole which I think are considerably
24 inflated over their actual necessity -- over what's
25 actually needed for the stated purpose.

1 When these missions are briefed to Congress,
2 I think that, in other words, there's a lot of fat. I
3 think Los Alamos lab should shrink to about -- right
4 now about 40, 35 percent of its present size. I think
5 the town of Los Alamos would be a much better town.

6 I think that the laboratory would have more
7 intellectual vibrancy. I think Northern New Mexico
8 would benefit enormously because I don't think that
9 there is any positive economic or political impact
10 from Los Alamos. I know I'm running out of time now.

11 Finally we have a legal obligation not only
12 to reduce our stockpile but to eliminate our
13 stockpile. This is not well appreciated here. But I
14 can assure you that in international circles where we
15 have also worked, the United States has no traction at
16 all because of its failure to implement its
17 obligations not just to reduce a little bit of the
18 excess weapons but to go ahead and to in good faith
19 work toward elimination of nuclear weapons all
20 together. Thank you.

21 MR. BROWN: Cedric Page. Todd Hindrichs.
22 And Mike Dempsey will follow Todd.

23 MR. HINDRICHS: My name is Todd Hindrichs and
24 I am a science writer with the communications art
25 services group at Los Alamos. I would just like to

1 say that I have read the complex transformation
2 documentation and I support the changes and streamline
3 that it entails.

4 One of the things that the documentation
5 accurately and appropriately points out, the
6 scientific benefits that the nuclear weapons program
7 and its apparatus like Road Runner and the physics
8 experimentation leads to scientific progress in other
9 areas of scientific research.

10 What I noticed when I was reading the
11 documentation is that the reverse is not clearly
12 articulated. Scientific programs that aren't directly
13 related to nuclear weapons are capable of providing
14 input to those programs.

15 And I would like to see the final record of
16 decision to contain a clearly articulated and
17 prominently featured statement of NNSA's commitment to
18 basic science research at its national scientific
19 laboratories. Thank you.

20 MR. BROWN: Mike Dempsey will be followed by
21 Joe Martz.

22 MR. DEMPSEY: Hi, my name is Mike Dempsey.
23 And I'm an employee of Los Alamos National Laboratory,
24 but I am speaking for myself. Thank you for the
25 opportunity.

1 I have prepared comments, but I'm not going
2 to read from them because I just want to say I
3 wholeheartedly support the preferred alternative. And
4 I would like to tell you why. I worked for Los Alamos
5 14 years. Before that I came from the WIPP in
6 Carlsbad and before that I worked in the uranium mines
7 in Grants.

8 And we can do this work safely,
9 environmentally aware, and we can do it. Some of the
10 other sites, I've been to the Nevada Test Site 26
11 times in the past two years performing materials
12 control accountability and nondestructive assay. And
13 that's a cannot-do facility.

14 And Los Alamos is a can-do facility. We can
15 do it here and we can please our customer and we can
16 make a quality product. And as long as there's
17 nuclear weapons in the world, the United States needs
18 the best nuclear weapons in the world.

19 Finally I would like to say that another
20 reason that the work should come here is that the tax
21 paying workers in New Mexico are pro-nuclear as
22 evidenced by the enrichment plant being built in
23 Hobbs. The taxpayers of Lea County and citizens of
24 Lea County wholeheartedly accept that.

25 The citizens of Carlsbad, New Mexico,

1 wholeheartedly accept the Waste Isolation Pilot
2 Project. And the citizens of Cibola and McKinley
3 Counties wholeheartedly accept the new uranium mill
4 that will be built there, the first one in 27 years,
5 and the uranium mines that will be opening in Grants
6 in the next year. I thank you very much for your
7 time. And please send us all the work we can, we'll
8 do it for you.

9 MR. BROWN: Joe Martz is up and David Clark
10 is after him.

11 MR. MARTZ: Thank you. I'm Joe Martz, I'm a
12 plutonium scientist that has been with the laboratory
13 for 25 years, though I speak as a private citizen. I
14 wish to make three points. One on stockpile
15 reductions, one on the environmental impact of the
16 proposed actions and the PEIS, and a final point on
17 science.

18 I'd like to briefly observe that I've been
19 attending hearings such as these for 20 years and
20 tonight is absolutely unprecedented. I want to thank
21 the community, I want to thank the employees of Los
22 Alamos National Laboratory, and I want to thank our
23 management team for the first time in my memory of
24 standing up and supporting the work that we do.

25 I'm proud of you in the audience tonight. I

1 never thought I would come to a hearing like this and
2 hear such outspoken and broad support for obviously
3 activities which I am in favor of and which support
4 our national security.

5 I endorse the preferred alternative of
6 distributed centers of excellence and I would like to
7 make a few brief comments as to why. First I came to
8 Los Alamos, I returned as a second generation employee
9 because of a firm vision that we could reduce the
10 number of nuclear weapons in our stockpile while still
11 preserving security and ultimately finding a better
12 way as Norris Bradbury once said.

13 We've had a 90 percent reduction in our
14 nuclear arsenal since the year I was born in 1965. To
15 anyone who would suggest that we are not fulfilling
16 our obligations under the nonproliferation treaty, I
17 would suggest to you that a 90 percent reduction is a
18 pretty damned good start.

19 Fifty percent of that reduction has occurred
20 since 2001 since President Bush took office. I know
21 it's in popular favor these days to criticize the
22 President for everything. But I think he deserves
23 tremendous credit for a visionary policy in which
24 we've been able to reduce our nuclear arsenals.

25 And the Supplemental Programmatic

1 Environmental Impact Statement embodies a very
2 progressive and forward looking concept in which we
3 replace the numbers of weapons in our arsenal with the
4 capability to build those weapons should and if they
5 would be required.

6 This is an extremely progressive policy. And
7 it's something which I have endorsed for 15 years,
8 with a short tip of the hat to Ted Gold and Rich
9 Wagner who first articulated that idea in 1991 in a
10 paper entitled Long Shadows and Virtual Swords. So
11 thank you Rich Wagner and Ted Gold.

12 My second point is the environmental impact.
13 I have carefully reviewed the SPEIS documents. And I
14 would agree with the speakers that say they lack
15 specificity. In particular it is my belief that the
16 preferred alternative offers substantial improvements
17 in environmental impacts particularly contrasted to
18 the no-action alternative.

19 It makes absolute common sense that moving
20 from a World War II era facility into a modern
21 building with less than half the footprint and half
22 the square footage in its nuclear space will result in
23 improvements in environment safety and security as
24 well as the consolidation activities which occur
25 nationwide and particularly the reduction in the need

1 for movement of nuclear materials.

2 I urge the department to carefully study
3 these benefits and articulate in more specific detail
4 precisely how this improves the environmental impact
5 of these operations.

6 Finally I wish to speak to the contributions
7 of science to this plan. I am first and foremost a
8 plutonium scientist. It is my strong belief that the
9 success of stewardship and the fact that we enable the
10 capability based deterrent has been grounded upon the
11 science in this laboratory and others have provided
12 for 65 years.

13 I note that when the pit manufacturing
14 activities began at Los Alamos to preserve that
15 capability in 1997, commensurate with that date -- and
16 I have studied this in detail -- the number of
17 plutonium science publications doubled at the
18 laboratory.

19 It is clear from the evidence that our
20 science output increased and improved commensurate
21 with undertaking small-scale manufacturing operations.
22 It should not be a coincidence, because it was through
23 our understanding of science that we were able to
24 certify these in new pits in the absence of nuclear
25 testing.

1 I would suggest that such scientific
2 endeavors will be required in the future. And we need
3 to remain every vigilant to support science at the
4 laboratory. One last figure and I will conclude my
5 remarks. Thank you.

6 It has been suggested that the science at the
7 laboratory is less than world class. I have looked
8 into this as well. Over the last ten years, Los
9 Alamos National Laboratory I believe is the world
10 leading scientific institution. And I have some data
11 to back that up.

12 We have approximately 40,000 refereed
13 publications from the laboratory over the last ten
14 years. Those have been cited a total of 200,000 times
15 in the literature. In physics alone Los Alamos
16 National Laboratory is cited over 100,000 times
17 according to Science Citation Index. This is far and
18 away the leading institution in the world for citation
19 of leading science.

20 A common metric at universities is the ratio
21 of citations to publications oftentimes not exceeding
22 one. At Los Alamos that ratio approaches seven. By
23 that standard we not only produce considerable
24 science, we produce considerable science which is used
25 by the rest of the world.

1 Indeed, this institution is a world leading
2 scientific institution. It is upon that science base
3 that we can propose this path forward with the SPEIS.
4 And I think it is essential that the department
5 continues to support that science in support of the
6 national security objectives as outlined. Thank you.

7 MR. CLARK: Thanks for everyone who stuck
8 around this late. My name is David Clark and I'm a
9 Los Alamos National Laboratory fellow. I'm also the
10 director of its Seaboard Institute.

11 I come here tonight as a citizen. And I want
12 to say that I arrived at the laboratory at the end of
13 the Cold War. And I represent a new generation of
14 scientists and engineers who have devoted our careers
15 to cleaning up the legacy of the Cold War.

16 I am proud to say that my efforts, that's my
17 personal efforts, have helped reduce the number of
18 nuclear weapons, supported the ban on underground
19 nuclear tests, and cleaned up environmental
20 contamination of the Cold War.

21 I submit to you that these goals are the same
22 as the goals of the many concerned citizens groups
23 that are represented at these hearings. We only
24 differ in the means by which we approach the problem.

25 I support the complex transformation because

1 it represents a natural and logical means to achieve
2 the legacy cleanup goal. It will cut the size of the
3 nuclear weapons complex in half, it will support
4 reducing the number of nuclear weapons, it will
5 replace aging facilities with state-of-the-art
6 laboratories with better security, better safety, and
7 better environmental compliance.

8 In the spirit of informed debate, I'd like to
9 point out that modern facilities like the CMR
10 replacement are crucial for the following reasons. As
11 a scientific leader, I want to remind everyone that
12 there's well over 2,000 metric tons of plutonium in
13 the world today in various forms.

14 And regardless of your views on how this
15 situation came to be, it is clear that large
16 inventories of plutonium will have to be prudently
17 managed for centuries. My generation didn't create
18 this legacy, we inherited it. And we are working to
19 find technical solutions to this incredibly complex
20 problem.

21 To succeed we'll have to stabilize and store
22 excess plutonium, we'll have to secure it against
23 theft and diversion, we must research modern reactor
24 concepts to burn down plutonium inventories, and we'll
25 have to improve our understanding of plutonium by

1 continuing to work at the frontiers of science.

2 And most importantly we'll need to continue
3 to attract and retain the best and brightest talent of
4 the next generation to be the future stewards of this
5 complex problem. We're going to need to conduct our
6 work in modern, safe, secure facilities like the
7 proposed CMR laboratories. Thank you.

8 MR. BROWN: Let me call two names of folks
9 who didn't respond earlier. First Liviu Popa-Simil
10 and also Cedric Page. Then let me call Lou Rosen. Is
11 Lou here?

12 That actually concludes the list of the folks
13 who have signed up. We actually have the luxury of
14 having a little extra time. Let me thank the number
15 of folks who had prepared statements who kept within
16 and even below the time limit.

17 We are available to take comments through ten
18 o'clock. And let me ask if there is anyone in the
19 room who hasn't spoken yet who would like to add a
20 comment at this point? If so, please raise your hand.

21 Also if there are folks who have spoken and
22 felt constrained by the time limit, if folks would
23 like to add anything again, please raise your hand and
24 I'll be happy to call on you. Yes.

25 MR. KNISS: Hello, I'm Bret Kniss, I'm an

1 employee of Los Alamos National Laboratory. Tonight I
2 speak to you as a representative of a smaller
3 organization, that would be the Kniss family. This is
4 a very small organization whose sole purpose in life
5 is to enjoy life in Northern New Mexico.

6 First I would like to extend my thanks to the
7 Department of Energy employees that took time away
8 from their family and friends and left their homes to
9 come here and gather comments from us in Los Alamos
10 County. Thank you very much for coming.

11 I'd like to say that I've read the entire
12 document that's known as the SPEIS. For the sake of
13 the environment, I hope that it's going to be printed
14 on recycled paper. I'm worried about the
15 environmental impacts associated with not doing that.

16 In general I find it to be a very well
17 organized, very well put together document. My soul
18 observation in summary would be that it is a document
19 that strikes the right balance between the needs of
20 the nation in terms of national security and the post
21 Cold War environment and also the other priorities
22 that drive the national budget at this point. I think
23 we have finally found the right balance between need
24 and investment. And I think that's well documented in
25 the SPEIS.

1 I'd like to extend my compliments to the
2 members of the Department of Energy that pulled this
3 document together. I'd also like to thank them for
4 coming here and gathering all the input from the
5 residents of Los Alamos County. Thank you very much.
6 And please enjoy your stay in Los Alamos.

7 MR. BROWN: Is there anyone else who would
8 like to add comments? Yes, please come forward. If
9 you could just provide your name for the court
10 reporter.

11 MS. KORZEKWA: Denise Korzekwa,
12 K-o-r-z-e-k-w-a. Hi, my name is Denise Korzekwa. I'm
13 a member of the Los Alamos community and I work at the
14 Los Alamos National Lab. I'm a metallurgical
15 engineer, I've been here 22 years, and my job is to
16 use casting modeling to reduce the number of actual
17 plutonium or uranium that we have to use here.

18 So we've developed this great computer code
19 that is open source and is being used by people all
20 over the world to learn how to do castings better.
21 And we are learning how to use it as well. So that
22 instead of making lots of pollution and lots of
23 plutonium and uranium waste, we're doing lots of
24 experiments on the computer and very few experiments
25 for real.

1 This gives us the opportunity to have lots
2 less waste, be lots more efficient. I think Los
3 Alamos is uniquely positioned to be able to do the
4 computer work, do the experimental work, reduce our
5 footprint, get rid of lots of these weapons that we
6 don't want, and be positioned should we have a nuclear
7 need in the future to have the responsive
8 infrastructure to make what we need. Thank you.

9 MR. POPA-SIMIL: Good evening. My name is
10 Liviu Popa-Simil. I am in Los Alamos since 2002. I
11 have worked in the past in nuclear engineering, I
12 worked in nuclear engineering for 20 years. And I
13 make the following comment.

14 I was looking to the map of reduction of DOE
15 and NNSA. And I find it a little bit aggressive,
16 because shutting down so many places all over the map
17 of the United States. It opens a little bit of
18 sensitivity in capability in the area of creating and
19 defending.

20 From my point of view, while you have a
21 nuclear in place, you already have the pollution in
22 place. And there is much to be done. So what was
23 done is done. And if you shut it down or you keep it
24 running, it doesn't bring too much pollution because
25 over the time it bring a lot of knowledge, how to

1 prevent pollution. So it brings more losses in the
2 skill of the population, in the capability of -- for
3 the staff that work in the nuclear field.

4 So in our country we did some big mistakes.
5 And one of the mistakes I can encounter is the
6 relation to the retirees. After that we cannot use
7 all the knowledge. And it was a big loss for our
8 institute and never wake up and never get back what it
9 did to us.

10 So a little bit more here. How you are
11 reducing the staff, what is the incentive for the
12 staff to come with creative work back to the institute
13 in order to maintain the capability. I think it is
14 good that they can -- I am sure that is in your
15 current day-to-day preoccupations and care.

16 And as a point of view as well, I think you
17 have enough bombs. You need to be sure about how they
18 are working safe. But you have not a lot of skills in
19 nuclear technology in order to commit to nuclear
20 power.

21 And I would suggest that nuclear energy is
22 one of the main gains in security system and safety of
23 United States. Nuclear power has a lot to do with
24 future energy and could be the best logical energy we
25 can get. And I will try to give an example, if I find

1 myself one.

2 If this would be plutonium, you have one
3 little -- and it will produce only a double size of
4 waste. The only way is to find a way to permit safe
5 and smart and without any impact. The same energy you
6 can get from about eight by eight miles surface of
7 solar rays for a wide territory.

8 And if you look well, you will see a higher
9 ecologic impact. But what matters is that it promotes
10 such nuclear technology and promotes the skills and
11 the value of each place in order to gain the maximum
12 efficiency for all education in place. And I thank
13 you for that and wish you a lot of success.

14 MR. BROWN: Anyone else to add anything?

15 If there is anybody who would like to make a
16 statement who is a little shy about public remarks, we
17 will remain available through ten. And if somebody
18 would like to speak just directly to the court
19 reporter, you're welcome to do that.

20 If no one else is ready to speak at this
21 point, we will recess. We will remain available
22 through ten o'clock. If anybody would like to add
23 something, please come up front and see us. Thank
24 you.

25 (Recess.)

1 MR. BROWN: It's now ten o'clock. And I'm
2 reconvening the meeting and asking if there's any
3 other member of the public who would like to make a
4 statement?

5 Noting that no one has a statement to make,
6 this meeting is officially adjourned.

7 (At 10:00 p.m. the hearing adjourned.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

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

I, JAN A. WILLIAMS, New Mexico CCR #14, DO
HEREBY CERTIFY that on March 12, 2008, the proceedings
in the above captioned matter were taken before me,
that I did report in stenographic shorthand the
proceedings set forth herein, and the foregoing pages
are a true and correct transcription to the best of my
ability.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am neither employed
by nor related to nor contracted with (unless excepted
by the rules) any of the parties or in this case, and
that I have no interest whatsoever in the final
disposition of these proceedings.

JAN A. WILLIAMS, RPR
New Mexico CCR #14
License Expires: 12/31/08

(6043A) JAW