

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, PUBLIC COMMENT PORTION

March 13, 2008

12:37 p.m.

Best Western Hilltop-House Hotel

400 Trinity Drive

Los Alamos, New Mexico

Reported by: Sally Peters

(6044A) SP

1           MR. BROWN: As we start this portion of our  
2 program, let me welcome representatives from Senator  
3 Bingaman's office, Senator Dominici's office, and  
4 Representative Wallace is joining us again. And in  
5 case representatives from other national or federal  
6 offices have come in since then, let me know. Is  
7 there anyone else other than those I have mentioned?  
8 And also we have a local official, Robert Gibson of  
9 the Los Alamos County Council is here as well. So  
10 again, thanks to all of you for your attendance.

11           It's now time to receive your formal  
12 comments on the proposed supplemental PEIS. This is  
13 your opportunity to provide DOE with your views on  
14 the draft document. The court reporter is ready to  
15 transcribe your statement.

16           Let me review a few ground rules for the  
17 formal comments. Please step up to the microphone  
18 over there when your name is called. Introduce  
19 yourself, providing an organizational affiliation  
20 where appropriate. If you have a written version of  
21 your statement, please provide a copy to the court  
22 reporter after you have completed your remarks.

23           I will call two names at a time, first of  
24 the speaker and the second of the person to follow.  
25 In view of number of people who have indicated an

1 interest in speaking this afternoon, please confine  
2 your public statement to five minutes. I will let  
3 you know when you have a minute left.

4 Ted Wyka will be serving as the hearing  
5 officer for the Department of Energy during the  
6 formal comment period. And a final reminder, if you  
7 have a cell phone, please turn that to the silent  
8 mode in deference to our speakers.

9 So with that by way of introduction, let me  
10 call on our first speaker, Stan Primak of the Los  
11 Alamos Chamber of Commerce, and Stan will be followed  
12 by Dr. Dennis Eerikson.

13 MR. STAN PRIMAK: Thank you. I am Stan  
14 Primak, and I am representing the Los Alamos Chamber  
15 of Commerce, and this year I am president of the Los  
16 Alamos Chamber of Commerce. The chamber represents  
17 over 300 businesses in Los Alamos and northern New  
18 Mexico, and I would like to submit our statement,  
19 rather than read it in its entirety, so that other  
20 people may speak. But we support the preferred  
21 alternative downsizing of the weapons complex  
22 nationally in the country. And we have a statement  
23 here, which again, I won't read, but I will submit  
24 that. Thank you very much.

25 The Los Alamos Chamber of Commerce supports

1 the proposed role of Los Alamos National Laboratory  
2 in the preferred alternative of NNSA's proposed  
3 complex transformation initiative. The Los Alamos  
4 chamber is comprised of more than 300 member  
5 businesses and organizations, most of which are  
6 located in the Los Alamos and northern New Mexico  
7 area. Our members employ thousands of residents in  
8 the area.

9 Our organization is interested in LANL  
10 conducting safe and secure operations. We are  
11 interested in our community continuing to contribute  
12 to vital national security interests. We are  
13 interested in seeing LANL capabilities and capacities  
14 being increasingly employed in solving important  
15 problems in the fields of energy security, health  
16 technologies, national security, nonproliferation,  
17 environmental technology, as well as in fundamental  
18 research that leads to advances in many fields.

19 We support the preferred alternative for  
20 the following reasons: Consolidating and modernizing  
21 facilities, consolidating operations, and decreasing  
22 the level of activity at LANL as is proposed by the  
23 preferred alternative will enable safer and more  
24 secure nuclear operations at Los Alamos. We see this  
25 as a positive development for our community and area.

1           The proposal facilitates the reduction of  
2           the nation's nuclear weapons stockpile. We believe  
3           this to be a positive direction for our community and  
4           nation.

5           The move toward a capability based  
6           deterrent and away from the need to maintain  
7           relatively larger stockpiles of weapons in order to  
8           constitute a deterrent is a positive development for  
9           our community and nation.

10           Please keep us informed about the progress  
11           of this SPEIS process, and don't hesitate to contact  
12           me in the event that we can clarify or provide more  
13           information about our position.

14           MR. BROWN: Thank you. Don Weiss will  
15           follow Dr. Eerikson.

16           DR. DENNIS J. EERIKSON: I would like to  
17           thank the DOE and the NNSA for the opportunity to  
18           comment. I come before you this afternoon as a long  
19           time resident of the state of New Mexico and the  
20           county of Los Alamos. I am also here as a physicist  
21           and a retiree from the University of California, and  
22           as a long time member of the Los Alamos National  
23           Laboratory for some 35 years.

24           During my time at the laboratory, I served  
25           as a scientist, as a programmatic leader, as a senior

1 manager, and for several years as a senior executive  
2 of the laboratory. My tenure included eight years as  
3 the lab director for environment, safety, and health.

4 I support the DOE's Draft Programmatic EIS  
5 for complex transformation, and I particularly  
6 support its preferred alternative. I believe the  
7 preferred alternative meets the objectives for the  
8 supplement, in that it provides a responsive  
9 capability consistent with the present and the  
10 future. It drives the downsizing of the capability  
11 for an increasingly smaller stockpile, and then  
12 finally it enhances the security for nuclear  
13 materials. I especially support the preferred  
14 alternative, as it's specific to the distribution  
15 centers of excellence and restructuring the nuclear  
16 materials facilities across the complex and this  
17 afternoon, I am most specifically in support of the  
18 assignment to Los Alamos National Laboratory for  
19 limited plutonium pit production.

20 I do so for the following reasons. The  
21 first is that Los Alamos National Laboratory is where  
22 the capability is today and I believe for the future.  
23 It is the place that has completely reengineered the  
24 technology for pit production, consistent with  
25 increasingly stringent expectations for stockpile

1 safety and reliability, for worker and public safety,  
2 and for proactive environmental stewardship.

3 Second, I support the assignment to Los  
4 Alamos for pit production, because I believe that as  
5 an American taxpayer, it is the best cost effective  
6 option to the American taxpayer, because this place  
7 already has the people in place. It already has the  
8 base facility capability and the base infrastructure  
9 to support the assignment.

10 Third, I believe the proposed pit  
11 production assignment for Los Alamos to be safe and  
12 that the risks are aggressively and adequately  
13 mitigated, and I use the decision that my wife and I  
14 made in our retirement as to where to live, we could  
15 have lived anyplace in this country, and we chose to  
16 stay here, here in Los Alamos, with the presence of  
17 the laboratory as its continuing focus.

18 And finally, the preferred alternative with  
19 respect to pit production drives the progressive  
20 downsizing of our nation's stockpile, I believe in  
21 the most responsible way for the country. And I  
22 think it allows increasing opportunity for more and  
23 more aggressive downsizing of this capability for our  
24 country. Thank you very much.

25 MR. BROWN: Okay. Don Weiss is next. He

1 will be followed by Mike Mallory.

2 MR. DON WEISS: I am Don Weiss, and I  
3 represent a company called SAG Construction and  
4 Services, and we are a small business based out of  
5 Espanola Valley, and I think it's important to factor  
6 in throughout the decision-making process the  
7 importance economically that Los Alamos National Labs  
8 has, you know, to this area, more so than most of the  
9 other facilities that are going through the  
10 evaluation process.

11 I can use ourselves as a classic example.  
12 If it was not for the laboratory and the  
13 opportunities that they have afforded us, as a small  
14 business to learn our trade understand federal  
15 contracting and whatnot, we would not have anywhere  
16 near the success that we currently have achieved over  
17 the last seven, eight years. You know, we work  
18 diligently with, almost exclusively, I should say,  
19 with other small businesses within northern New  
20 Mexico, and I can tell you for a fact that without  
21 Los Alamos labs and without the support of NNSA and  
22 DOE to the small business community, you know, the  
23 vast percentage of the small businesses here in  
24 northern New Mexico would truly not exist.

25 Like I said, the lab has been very, very

1 supportive of us and has allowed us not only to grow  
2 as an organization here in northern New Mexico, but  
3 refine our skills in our backyard per se, and then be  
4 able to go out nationally, and we have had success in  
5 working with other DOE and other types of Corps of  
6 Engineer, Department of Defense facilities throughout  
7 the country. So I think it's an important aspect,  
8 and it probably doesn't get the notoriety or the  
9 attention that I believe it really should get. Thank  
10 you.

11 MR. BROWN: Mike Mallory will be followed  
12 by David Torney.

13 MR. MIKE MALLORY: Good afternoon. Thank  
14 you for the opportunity to speak this afternoon. I  
15 am the principal associate director for business and  
16 operations. I work for lands at the Los Alamos  
17 laboratory. In the last 30 years, I have also worked  
18 at the Kansas City plant and also the Pantex plant.

19 I am here today to support the preferred alternative  
20 that is being proposed by the Department of Energy.

21 Based on my years of experience, I believe  
22 that the alternative outlined is the appropriate one  
23 for the Department of Energy, the nuclear weapons  
24 complex, and also the sites and communities that have  
25 been affected. I believe the proposed centers of

1 excellence approach to modernizing the US weapons  
2 complex will make the most effective use of those  
3 resources that are already in place, while ensuring  
4 the evolution necessary to meet the national security  
5 needs in the 21st century.

6           For Los Alamos, its selection as the center  
7 for plutonium excellence makes very good sense. I  
8 came here on June 1, 2006 as a part of the new  
9 organization that would run the laboratory. My first  
10 year here, I dedicated my activities to working at  
11 the plutonium facility and developing the capability,  
12 the first in 19 years that the United States could  
13 make a pit to put into the stockpile. So I have a  
14 lot of experience with that facility, and it is right  
15 now the only facility in the United States that can  
16 process plutonium and support our stockpile.

17           The preferred alternative is not about  
18 expanding pit production. That capability has  
19 existed at the laboratory for decades. In fact,  
20 there is no expansion that's proposed. Utilizing the  
21 existing facilities, we could make more pits than  
22 have been built in the past, but basically the  
23 facility, and the replacement of existing facilities  
24 with new plutonium facilities, is very consistent  
25 with what has happened at the laboratory for many,

1 many years.

2           The purpose of the complex transformation  
3 project is to streamline operations and reduce LANL's  
4 nuclear footprint, and to reduce it by replacing it  
5 with smaller but newer facilities, and also to reduce  
6 the number of staff that support the nuclear weapons  
7 activity. And for those reasons, I do support the  
8 preferred alternative. Thank you.

9           MR. BROWN: Thank you.

10           David will be followed by Mike Burns.

11           MR. DAVID TORNEY: I am David Torney. I  
12 live in Jemez Springs, and I found this to be an  
13 informative meeting. A lot of things that happen  
14 concerning nuclear weapons are secret, but I feel  
15 that the NNSA has gotten lost in details, and if a  
16 new pit factory is desired, then it should be a zero  
17 emission factory, like a biosphere that's in Tucson.  
18 In other words, you know, it seems that the  
19 technological challenges for building a self,  
20 completely contained operation can be met and should  
21 be embraced, and either it should be built properly,  
22 or it should be done properly or not at all. If the  
23 usual slipshod approach is used, for whatever, for  
24 budgetary constraints or for whatever reasons, I  
25 think Congress will kill the funding for this if it's

1 not done at the highest -- you know, if it's not done  
2 as carefully as possible.

3 And furthermore, before anyone talks about  
4 building new facilities, there is the Cold War legacy  
5 of the Department of Energy which needs to be cleaned  
6 up, and I don't think anyone should allow new  
7 facilities to be built until that's done. Thank you.

8 MR. BROWN: Mike Burns.

9 Suzy Kane will be next.

10 MR. MIKE BURNS: Good afternoon. Thank you  
11 for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft  
12 SPEIS, and for me to be able to state clearly that I  
13 support the preferred alternative the government is  
14 studying and wish to see it endorsed in the  
15 government's record of decision. I have reached that  
16 conclusion based on two fundamental facts and  
17 considerations. One, based on where I live, and two,  
18 based on what I have done and what I am doing now.

19 First I am a citizen of Los Alamos County  
20 here in New Mexico. I have been so off and on since  
21 1969. I married here 25 years ago. My children were  
22 born here, and we raised them here. Therefore, we  
23 are directly and significantly affected by the action  
24 the government takes in this matter.

25 Second, I have had a base of professional

1 experience that leads me to believe there is a huge  
2 synergistic value between the nuclear weapons complex  
3 and non-weapons related national security programs.

4 I have reached that conclusion based on my experience  
5 as a former special assistant to the president in the  
6 White House on Homeland Security Council staff, as an  
7 office director in the Department of Homeland  
8 Security's Science and Technology Directorate, and as  
9 an inspector in Iraq for the International Atomic  
10 Energy Agency.

11 Right now I am the deputy associate  
12 director for threat reduction programs at the Los  
13 Alamos National Laboratory. That position and those  
14 experiences have shown me the great synergistic value  
15 between nuclear trained experts and expertise and  
16 facilities on nuclear weapons complex and the conduct  
17 of programs meeting the nation's responsibilities in  
18 diverse areas, such as nonproliferation, counter  
19 proliferation, counter terrorism, nuclear assessment  
20 monitoring and response, nuclear forensics and  
21 attribution and support to the intelligence  
22 community.

23 Fundamentally without the nuclear weapons  
24 complex, without a viable, safe, secure, and reliable  
25 nuclear weapons complex, we cannot conduct those

1 programs and meet those responsibilities. For  
2 example, here at Los Alamos, the threat reduction  
3 programs are charged with providing the science and  
4 technology to eliminate global threats, especially  
5 those associated with weapons of mass destruction.  
6 Today using people trained in the weapons complex and  
7 that are part of the weapons complex, we train and  
8 provide inspectors for the IAEA, giving this nation  
9 some confidence in the international nonproliferation  
10 regime.

11 As part of the international  
12 nonproliferation expert control program, we send  
13 people to the four corners of the globe teaching  
14 like-minded countries how to protect their  
15 technologies and their commerce against the  
16 proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.  
17 Likewise, we send people all over the place, to often  
18 inhospitable places, to help monitor and warn of the  
19 illicit movement of special nuclear materials. We  
20 support the US government in technical diplomatic  
21 missions, like on the Korean peninsula.

22 We maintain a 24/7 watch to provide  
23 technical expertise for emergency response. People  
24 in Los Alamos carry around pagers like that, that if  
25 they go off, it means an immediate response is

1 required to address a nuclear emergency response  
2 situation, and that expertise only comes from people  
3 trained in the nuclear weapons complex. We help the  
4 nation keep continuously vigilant for and assess  
5 signs of nuclear activity from space to the surface  
6 of the earth, because it takes a weapons program to  
7 find a covert or illicit weapons program.

8 We help other countries secure their  
9 nuclear material. We dispose of excess US nuclear  
10 weapons components in a way that facilitates civilian  
11 nuclear power programs. We recover thousands of  
12 radioactive sources from around the globe, helping to  
13 reduce safety problems and the threat of radioactive  
14 dispersal devices.

15 MR. BROWN: You have a minute left.

16 MR. TORNEY: So after that long list and  
17 the idea of a minute left, I just want to say that we  
18 cannot do all of those things that are important to  
19 non-nuclear weapons related national security  
20 programs, without the basis of a nuclear weapons  
21 complex from which we draw the skills and expertise  
22 to do so. Thank you very much.

23 MR. BROWN: Suzy Kane.

24 And Shannyn Solitt will be next.

25 MS. SUZY KANE: Thank you. I am a private

1 citizen from Taos. And in the year 2000 when there  
2 were fires in Los Alamos, Taos was under a black  
3 blanket, and I am concerned about the air quality and  
4 safety issues here. I also support the nuclear  
5 nonproliferation treaty, which I understood to mean  
6 that it was that nobody was going to build any new  
7 nuclear weapons, and I thought you mentioned 10,000  
8 pits at Pantex. That's quite adequate. I would love  
9 to see that reduced.

10 And I also think that Rocky Flats was a  
11 great example of some of the dangers that exist by  
12 producing more pits here in Los Alamos, that there  
13 were issues that Rocky Flats raised that are not  
14 being addressed here. For instance, at Rocky Flats,  
15 this grand jury discovered, when the grand jury was  
16 closed down by the Justice Department -- which is not  
17 actually legal -- but they were burning plutonium  
18 waste in an incinerator illegally at night, and the  
19 clouds just went over the suburbs of Denver.

20 And what I would like to know is -- and  
21 also these people, actually to get their job done  
22 quicker, eliminated the filters because they were  
23 holding things up. So what I want to know is, why  
24 should I trust you? That worries me. So thank you.

25 MR. BROWN: Jessica Wilbanks will follow

1 Shannyn.

2 MS. SHANNYN SOLITT: Hello. My name is  
3 Shannyn Solitt, and I am one of the few downwinders  
4 and downstreamers that have come to speak at these  
5 hearings to express our concerns about the proposed  
6 development of a new pit production facility here in  
7 Los Alamos. I care greatly about world peace and the  
8 care of the earth and about future generations on the  
9 planet, and I spend my life in dedication working for  
10 these things. And I cannot fathom how there can be a  
11 support for the kind of proliferation of nuclear  
12 weapons like I heard last night in the hearings.

13 I recognize that you feel up here that you  
14 are fulfilling an important function for national  
15 security here, but that idea is as old as your  
16 facility. The argument holds no water, that nuclear  
17 deterrence is necessary to secure world peace. Since  
18 the development of the first nuclear weapons, the US  
19 has been involved in at least 18 wars -- Korea,  
20 Guatemala, Cuba, Indonesia, Congo, Peru, Laos,  
21 Vietnam, Cambodia, Lebanon, Grenada, Libya, El  
22 Salvador, Nicaragua, Panama, Bosnia, Afghanistan, and  
23 Iraq.

24 Because of our nuclear dominance, we think  
25 we have a license to bomb and attack relatively

1 defenseless people. Of course, then, we have a  
2 proliferation of terrorism. We entered the current  
3 war because of nuclear weapons, and because of  
4 nuclear weapons, we are threatening to enter another  
5 war. By this new plan to proliferate new nuclear  
6 weapons, the program is inciting more countries to  
7 want to build nuclear weapons to protect themselves  
8 against the US. The proposed activities of this lab  
9 are creating more enmity and danger for America.

10 I am dreaming of the day that some day  
11 someone from Los Alamos will get up at a hearing and  
12 say, "We don't need new weapons. We have already  
13 made the best ones ever. In fact, we have the best  
14 stockpile in the world that will be good for at least  
15 another 35, if not a hundred years." I am waiting  
16 for the time for someone from Los Alamos to get up  
17 and say they want the lab to focus on cleaning up the  
18 terrible mess that has been made and using the  
19 brilliant science minds up here to figure out how to  
20 remediate the radioactivity. I am waiting for the  
21 vision to come from Los Alamos, that we could be up  
22 here -- you could be the leaders in creating  
23 appropriate technologies and developing renewable  
24 energy sources.

25 Will any of your great scientists ever

1 suggest, that given the past history of nuclear bomb  
2 factory, i.e., Rocky Flats, maybe it would be not  
3 such a good idea to put this pit manufacturing  
4 facility at the top of the watershed of an entire  
5 bio-region. Does anyone care here about the downwind  
6 and downstream people? What about the high rates of  
7 cancer right here in your own community?

8           Maybe you don't have the kind of vision  
9 that exists in other parts of New Mexico or the  
10 world, or maybe you are just afraid to get up in  
11 front of your community and share a vision for a  
12 peaceful and sustainable world, afraid if you do you  
13 will lose your job or be chastised. Well, you don't  
14 have to do it at a public hearing. The important  
15 thing, if you think you might like to see the labs  
16 take a different course, is to put it on paper and  
17 send it to all of our New Mexico legislative body --  
18 Dominici, Udall, Bingaman. They are the ones who  
19 need to hear that the Los Alamos folks care not only  
20 about their jobs, but actually other human beings in  
21 the future of the planet.

22           I heard that they employed the same people  
23 at Rocky Flats for six years after that facility was  
24 shut down. If you present a clear vision to our  
25 legislators for a positive future for Los Alamos, New

1 Mexico, America, and the whole earth, it might just  
2 happen that you and your children would be honored to  
3 live and work in such a place and receive the honor  
4 from the rest of the people in New Mexico, especially  
5 the downwind people.

6 And people question when I present what the  
7 project is that I support, which is the Los Alamos  
8 Peace Project, which is to transform the laboratories  
9 of weapons of mass destruction into institutions that  
10 engage only in life-affirming research and  
11 development. That is the vision I hold for the  
12 world, for Los Alamos, for the future of your  
13 community, and I believe that we cannot achieve  
14 anything until we first ask for it. So thank you for  
15 allowing this opportunity for a downwinder to come  
16 and address the Los Alamos community.

17 MR. BROWN: Jessica Wilbanks and B. Jo Baer  
18 is next.

19 MS. JESSICA WILBANKS: Hello. My name is  
20 Jessica Wilbanks, and I am a private citizen as well  
21 from Taos, New Mexico. I also serve as the  
22 coordinator of Faithful Security, and we are a  
23 multi-faith coalition committed to the elimination of  
24 nuclear weapons. Our coalition partners include the  
25 United Methodist Church, the Evangelical Lutheran

1 Church of America, the Episcopal Church, the Islamic  
2 Society of North America, the Religious Action Center  
3 of Reform Judaism, and there are others, but I will  
4 spare you the litany.

5 Suffice to say that the vast majority of  
6 religious bodies in the United States and the world  
7 are committed to building a world free of nuclear  
8 weapons. We believe that the only way we can come  
9 out from under the nuclear shadow is to do what  
10 leading experts recommend, partner with other nations  
11 to ensure verifiable multi-lateral disarmament. With  
12 today's tensions over the Iranian nuclear energy  
13 program, the weaponization of North Korea, and  
14 instability in Pakistan, the only way to prevent a  
15 nuclear weapon from being used over the long term is  
16 to move toward disarmament.

17 Two years ago, advocates of disarmament  
18 were joined by conservative statesmen, such as  
19 William Perry, Sam Nunn, George Shultz, and Henry  
20 Kissinger. With individuals such as these beginning  
21 with the premise that disarmament is both possible  
22 and desirable, we are now well on our way to seeing a  
23 world free of nuclear weapons.

24 The world's leading experts on nuclear  
25 issues have laid out a gradual plan for disarmament

1 that takes all of these concerns into account, and  
2 ensures security during the disarmament process. We  
3 have the know-how, and what we need now is the  
4 commitment, and that brings me to today. The  
5 Department of Energy has laid out a plan that  
6 purports itself to be about downsizing and  
7 reductions, and yet centers on the production of new  
8 plutonium pits. This multi-billion dollar commitment  
9 would be a long term investment in the business of  
10 building new nuclear weapons.

11 My biggest question for you is, how can the  
12 Department of Energy be so shortsighted? You know  
13 full well that the next president is required by law  
14 to complete a new Nuclear Posture Review in 2009.  
15 Today, the House is naming the members of a  
16 commission tasked with examining the role of nuclear  
17 weapons in today's security paradigm, and last year,  
18 the administration requested a small sum for the  
19 reliable replacement warhead, only to see it  
20 completely zeroed out in both the House and Senate.  
21 Why is the Department of Energy continuing to push  
22 forward a proposal without legs? If Congress refused  
23 to fund a paltry sum for the reliable replacement  
24 warhead program, then how can we expect Congress to  
25 move forward with a provocative plan to dramatically

1 ramp up the manufacturing capabilities of the nuclear  
2 weapons complex, and all of this in the absence of a  
3 national dialog on the role of nuclear weapons in our  
4 security policy.

5           The political leadership of New Mexico is  
6 increasingly on board with mission change. Espanola  
7 Mayor Joseph Maestas, Representative Tom Udall, Mayor  
8 David Coss are all known as strong proponents of  
9 mission change. They may not share my moral  
10 conviction that nuclear weapons should never be used,  
11 but they understand the numbers. Nuclear weapons are  
12 a dinosaur industry. They are on the way out.

13           MR. BROWN: You have about a minute.

14           MS. WILBANKS: Thank you.

15           New Mexico needs to be ahead of the curve.  
16 We need to strengthen our economy by transforming the  
17 laboratories. I am only one taxpayer in New Mexico,  
18 but if you visit other communities, I have no doubt  
19 that you will hear the same message. How can you  
20 come to our community with a proposal that you know  
21 full well is not politically or economically  
22 sustainable and will never pass through Congress?  
23 Instead I speak for some of the nation's largest  
24 religious bodies, and an increasing number of New  
25 Mexicans, when I tell you I want to see a proposal

1 for complex transformation that includes real mission  
2 change, funding for cleanup, and dismantlement.

3 Thank you for your time.

4 MR. BROWN: Thanks.

5 B. Jo Baer, and after that, Erik  
6 Kurtschtel.

7 MS. B. JO BAER: I am a 30 year resident of  
8 Los Alamos, and I have a very brief statement, that I  
9 am concerned about the health issues, the  
10 implications. Anyone who Googles the cancer  
11 incidence in Los Alamos will find pages of studies  
12 indicating the incidence of cancer. And most  
13 particularly, this past weekend, I came across a  
14 medical report that, at the present time, shows an  
15 increase in cancer among children. That concerns me  
16 greatly, and I think any increase in the proposal  
17 would be something that I don't support.

18 I also would like to just point out  
19 briefly, that I think the United States is a party to  
20 this non-nuclear proliferation treaty, and it seems  
21 to me that if there are any increases, it might be in  
22 violation of international law.

23 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

24 Erik Kurtschtel.

25 MR. ERIK KUERSCHNER. It's Erik Kuerschner.

1 Excuse me for my sloppy writing, it's Erik  
2 Kuerschner. That's why I don't use that in my email,  
3 because nobody knows how to spell it.

4 MR. BROWN: Okay. Well, the next speaker  
5 is David Clark and I think we have that right.

6 MR. KUERSCHNER: My name is Erik  
7 Kuerschner. I am an economist and a builder from  
8 Taos, New Mexico, and I want to just be real brief.  
9 I wasn't really prepared to speak, and it was kind of  
10 just a spur of the moment thing. But the first thing  
11 I would like to do is I would like to be on the  
12 record that I have spoken to Ted Wyka, and that our  
13 county commissioners have voted unanimously to  
14 protect the interests and look after the welfare of  
15 their constituents, which is all of Taos County. We  
16 are directly in the wind shed to the north. We need  
17 to have a hearing like this, and we were disappointed  
18 that we weren't included in the regional schedule.

19 So anyway, around the 27th, Ted will  
20 receive that letter soon. I have spoken to him, and  
21 I hope we can negotiate some reasonable way so that  
22 we can resolve the differences.

23 The second thing I want to say that as an  
24 economist, I am really just disturbed -- and I  
25 brought this up at the draft EIS the last time, and

1     why I didn't get so involved, there is not a no  
2     build. This is like a test, putting a new drug on  
3     the market and saying, well, we know the drug works,  
4     so we don't want to deprive anybody of it, so we will  
5     give everybody a little bit and some a lot. It just  
6     doesn't work that way. To understand what the  
7     project is or what it is that you are doing, it's  
8     absolutely necessary that you have a no build, which  
9     means what happens if we don't do anything.

10           I will give you an example, in 1972 I was  
11     staff economist for Skidmore, Owings and Merrill, an  
12     environmental study group. I believe we were the  
13     group that got DOT to put a no build into the EIS.  
14     As far as I know, it was the very first one. As a  
15     result, we did a real study, looked at what  
16     transportation was accomplishing, noticed that cars  
17     wouldn't hack it. Even at that time they were  
18     adamant in not transferring money to light rail. We  
19     got them to do that.

20           And if anyone goes to Portland today, it's  
21     heads and shoulders, because of the no build. Had we  
22     not had Howard Makee, as the director, and George  
23     Baldion, as the transportation chairman of Oregon,  
24     working with the US Highway Department, Portland  
25     would have been trashed. It's a beautiful town where

1 real estate prices are rising, because we built it on  
2 \$8 a gallon gasoline. Whereas towns that are spread  
3 out and have their infrastructure built on \$2 a  
4 gallon gasoline are suffering.

5           The third thing is that I find the  
6 economics in this abysmal. That's all I can say.  
7 There is no cost benefit analysis. There is a choice  
8 between, in essence, a road to nowhere and a road to  
9 oblivion. We don't do any real analysis. In fact,  
10 everything is backwards. I see in the report that  
11 they think that the more jobs pit production  
12 provides, the better we are. Well, economics is  
13 exactly the opposite. I mean, if I build a house and  
14 I can frame it with four workers rather than eight  
15 workers, I am better off with less workers.

16           The way I look at it is Los Alamos takes  
17 12,000 people out of socially productive uses, and  
18 the rest of us have to support this. The same is  
19 true with the money that goes in. In fact, if we  
20 stop talking about I believe it's better, I believe  
21 it's gain, and we all work together for the benefit  
22 of all of us, if you look at the data, New Mexico has  
23 been as high as 35th in relative median income. It's  
24 down to about 46 now. And basically what is  
25 happening is all the money that goes into LANL, when

1       there is no more goods and services for anybody to  
2       buy, that means you are competing against us. It's  
3       just giving the people on the hill a greater share of  
4       the items that can be purchased and us a lesser  
5       share.

6                 In fact, there are graphs that correlate  
7       LANL budget with that rank. And guess what, the more  
8       LANL gets, the poorer everyone else gets. It reminds  
9       me of that Rye Cooter's song that says, "The same  
10      thing that makes her rich, makes me poor." Well,  
11      that's the way that it is with LANL. The same thing  
12      that makes the guys on the hill rich, makes the rest  
13      of us poor. Thank you.

14                MR. BROWN: David Clark, and Joe Martz will  
15      follow David Clark.

16                MR. DAVID CLARK: Hello, my name is David  
17      Clark, and I am a Los Alamos National Laboratory  
18      fellow and a director of its Seaboard Institute. I  
19      also come as a citizen to say that I arrived at the  
20      lab at the end of the Cold War, and I represent a new  
21      generation of scientists and engineers at Los Alamos.  
22      I have devoted my career to cleaning up the legacy of  
23      the Cold War, and I am going to address some of the  
24      questions of the audience here about that in a few  
25      minutes.

1           I am proud to say that my personal efforts  
2     have helped reduce the number of nuclear weapons,  
3     supported the ban on underground nuclear tests, and  
4     cleaned up environmental contamination of the Cold  
5     War. I submit to you that these goals are the same  
6     as those of the many concerned citizen groups that  
7     are represented at these hearings, we only differ in  
8     the means to achieve the same common goals.

9           I support the complex transformation,  
10    because for me it represents a natural and logical  
11    means to achieve the legacy cleanup goal. It will  
12    cut the size of the nuclear weapons complex in half,  
13    it will support reducing the number of nuclear  
14    weapons, it will replace aging facilities with state  
15    of the art laboratories and better security, better  
16    safety, and better environmental compliance.

17           So now I want to address a few questions  
18    that popped up. You asked for a LANL scientist to  
19    stand up and say a few things. Well, I'm going to  
20    say a few things. Someone asked that you had to  
21    clean up the legacy before building any new  
22    buildings. Someone else said that they wanted a Los  
23    Alamos scientist to say we should clean up the  
24    environment. Well, let me tell you what I have done  
25    for the last decade with my career.

1           I led a small scientific team that went up  
2           to Rocky Flats. We used state of the art x-ray  
3           science to unlock the mysteries of plutonium behavior  
4           in the environment, and from that we developed a  
5           science based cleanup strategy that led to the most  
6           significant cleanup in the history of superfund  
7           legislation. We personally got rid of 385 acres of  
8           military industrial complex. We removed 805 concrete  
9           structures. Some of them were huge. We are asking  
10          for one small building in return. We remediated  
11          98,000 tons of contaminated soils, and we stabilized,  
12          stored, packaged, and removed 26 tons of weapons  
13          usable plutonium from the Denver metropolitan area.

14                 So I submit to you that there is a new  
15          generation of scientists at the laboratories, and we  
16          are working our tails off trying to achieve legacy  
17          cleanup goals, but to continue to do this mission, we  
18          really need modern, state of the art facilities,  
19          because that's where we do the work. And right now,  
20          we work in 50 to 60 year old antiquated facilities  
21          with outdated air handling, outdated facilities.  
22          It's pathetic what we have to work in. I apologize.

23                 So I support the complex transformation.  
24          We do have people at Los Alamos that are just as  
25          passionate as the rest of you, and we are doing our

1 best to help clean up the legacy of the Cold War, and  
2 frankly we need your support. We need broad  
3 community support to continue these important  
4 missions, and I support the complex transformation  
5 for those reasons. Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: Joe Martz. Joni Arends will  
7 follow Joe.

8 MR. JOE MARTZ: Thank you. I am Joe Martz.  
9 I am a plutonium scientist for my entire career at  
10 Los Alamos, and I speak as a private citizen. I  
11 support the complex transformation, and would like to  
12 see the preferred alternative reflected in the record  
13 of decision, and I would like to speak for several  
14 reasons as to why I came to that conclusion.

15 I am going to cover three topics. One, I  
16 want to speak on the responsiveness of this proposal  
17 to prior requests, including requests by progressive  
18 groups, including the recent editorials written by  
19 senior members of prior administrations. I will also  
20 speak on the environmental impacts of the  
21 transformation and the benefits that brings, and I  
22 will conclude by speaking somewhat about the impact  
23 on science and on stockpile reduction.

24 I have been at these hearings for 20 years.  
25 I have observed many of the same faces in the

1 audience, and I find it quite extraordinary how far  
2 we have come in two decades. We are no longer  
3 arguing about whether or not we need larger weapons  
4 or more. We are just simply talking about a means to  
5 reduce and still protect our security. So sometimes  
6 in our differences and in our heated passion, we tend  
7 to ignore our common objectives. I just want to  
8 credit everyone here -- activist citizens and  
9 laboratory employees alike, because through informed  
10 dialog, we can find a better way to our futures.

11 I remember in these hearings as long ago as  
12 1993, at that time the Rocky Flats plant had been  
13 shut down, but a decision had not been made to close  
14 it. In those hearings in 1993, I distinctly recall  
15 testimony from activist groups. That testimony said,  
16 we would support bringing pit manufacturing to Los  
17 Alamos, but we have a couple of conditions. We would  
18 like to see the closure of Rocky Flats, and we would  
19 like to see a much smaller manufacturing capability  
20 brought to the laboratory if we enable that.

21 That's precisely where we are today. If  
22 you look back as long as 15 years, the government's  
23 proposals today are indeed responsive to citizen  
24 concerns that were voiced in those hearings. As  
25 recently as 2002, as part of stockpile stewardship

1 programmatic environmental impact statement hearings,  
2 the modern pit facility was being considered. At  
3 that time, it was determined that perhaps a capacity  
4 up to several hundred pits per year may be required  
5 in support of national security objectives. Once  
6 again, I sat in these hearings and I listened to a  
7 diverse array of groups argue for the fact that we  
8 would not have to build a modern pit facility, that  
9 instead, a small capacity at Los Alamos would be  
10 sufficient to meet the nation's needs should that be  
11 required. In fact, one particular activist group  
12 even suggested a capacity in those discussions in  
13 2002. They said a capacity of 50 to 80 pits per year  
14 should be adequate.

15 Here we are six years later, and I find it  
16 remarkable that the government has proposed precisely  
17 what the activist groups had asked for six years ago.  
18 During this week, I have listened to groups  
19 throughout New Mexico. Many of those groups have  
20 pleaded and asked why aren't our voices heard by the  
21 government? I would suggest to you that those voices  
22 have been explicitly heard, they have been  
23 acknowledged, and they are now reflected in the  
24 proposal that has been put forth before you.

25 I find the programmatic environmental

1 impact statement to be exceptionally responsive to  
2 those citizen groups, as well as to the requests of  
3 distinguished members such as Henry Kissinger, George  
4 Shultz, and Bill Perry, who have argued for a gradual  
5 reduction leading to an elimination of nuclear  
6 weapons. I wholeheartedly support that goal. I came  
7 to Los Alamos, having grown up here, with the  
8 objective of finding ways to reduce our reliance on  
9 nuclear weapons. I have stated many times over 20  
10 years, I would like to see a dramatic reduction of  
11 nuclear weapons in my career. I believe the work of  
12 the laboratory will help enable those reductions.

13 Embodied in this proposal is a remarkable  
14 concept, a concept that, frankly, I was almost  
15 shocked to see embraced by this government so soon.  
16 It's a concept of a capability based deterrent. That  
17 concept proposes, that instead of deploying large  
18 numbers of nuclear weapons, we can instead rely upon  
19 the capability to produce them, when and if they  
20 would be needed. That capability is critically  
21 dependent upon timing. It is essential that we  
22 respond more quickly than a potential adversary could  
23 surprise us.

24 MR. BROWN: You have a minute left.

25 MR. MARTZ: Thank you.

1           The two adversaries of note would be a  
2 resurgent China or a recidivist Russia. In either  
3 case, careful assessments of those threats have shown  
4 that a responsive capability on the order of five  
5 years will be sufficient to protect our security.  
6 This proposal recognizes that, and through the  
7 development of a modern, responsive infrastructure  
8 supported by modern facilities, we can achieve that  
9 goal of protecting our security and relying more on  
10 our capability and less upon the number of weapons.

11           We do so with dramatically reduced  
12 environmental impact. I live about 7,000 feet  
13 downwind from TA-55. I have lived there for almost  
14 20 years. I am a real downwinder, and I have to tell  
15 you, I am extremely concerned about the environmental  
16 emissions from these operations. That's why I  
17 support this activity. It's commonsense, in that  
18 moving from a World War II era facility to a modern  
19 building built to modern standards, we will reduce  
20 dramatically our environmental impacts, while  
21 improving the safety and security.

22           For all of these reasons, and particularly  
23 for the competence of my colleagues and the science  
24 they represent, I am proud to endorse the preferred  
25 alternative in support of the programmatic

1 environmental impact statement.

2 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

3 Joni Arends. And she will be followed by  
4 Holly Beaumont.

5 MS. JONI ARENDS: Good afternoon. My name  
6 is Joni Arends. I am with Concerned Citizens for  
7 Nuclear Safety based in Santa Fe, and thank you for  
8 this opportunity.

9 Our first request is a 90 day extension of  
10 time. We need more time to go through this document.  
11 Since early January, we have been commenting on  
12 various documents that have been presented to us from  
13 EPA, from the New Mexico Environment Department, from  
14 DOE. These include the draft worker permit for Los  
15 Alamos and for Sandia, the storm water permit, the  
16 Buckman documents, permit modifications for WIPP, and  
17 then at Sandia, the draft worker permit. And we need  
18 more time to be able to evaluate this proposal, so I  
19 ask again for a 90 day extension of time to comment.

20 I would like to address this fact sheet  
21 here, this claim. Claim versus fact: The truth  
22 about LANL's role in complex transformation. This is  
23 going to be kind of detailed, but I want to make sure  
24 that this gets in the record. We are very concerned.  
25 It says here that some opponents to the LANL and the

1 complex transformation project are spreading  
2 falsehoods about LANL and its mission. Here are some  
3 of the facts. I'm going to address three facts that  
4 are listed on here at the bottom of this page, about  
5 the air emissions, about the water, use of water, and  
6 the seismic issues, the accident scenarios. Other  
7 people can address the expanded weapons production  
8 issues.

9           So if we go to the summary of this  
10 document -- this document here -- and we go to page  
11 S71, which is the summary, now all of these  
12 alternatives are on the table, all four alternatives  
13 are on the table. If we look under the consolidated  
14 nuclear center, it says that, under air quality,  
15 operations would result in incremental increases less  
16 than five percent of the baseline for most  
17 pollutants. The greatest increase would occur for  
18 total suspended particulates, or TSP, which could  
19 increase by 28 percent. Now this is the NNSA  
20 document. This is the LANL fact sheet, or claim  
21 versus fact.

22           So they say that the claim at the higher  
23 level of pit production, LANL could increase airborne  
24 pollutants by 28 percent, which is what the NNSA said  
25 in their document. But LANL says, fact, the higher

1 level of pit production is not the preferred  
2 alternative -- which is a fact. Ordinary dust from  
3 construction may increase by up to 28 percent and is  
4 limited to that phase of the activities.

5 Well, why is it necessary? Our role as  
6 NGOs in northern New Mexico is to inform the public  
7 about the proposal, and I am appalled by this fact  
8 sheet. That when we put out facts from the NNSA,  
9 LANL says they are claims. That's not right. We are  
10 putting out the facts, and LANL calls them claims.

11 Let me proceed. Claim, LANL's current  
12 water rights would be exceeded by ten percent. Let's  
13 go to page S-73. Under the consolidated nuclear  
14 production center, "Annual groundwater use would  
15 increase by approximately 110 percent. LANL  
16 groundwater use would exceed water rights by  
17 approximately 212 million gallons per year." That's  
18 650 acre feet per year -- 650 acre feet per year for  
19 plutonium pit production.

20 LANL says, "The fact is the preferred  
21 alternative states that LANL water use would remain  
22 within existing water rights." That is true, but the  
23 people of northern New Mexico need to know, that one  
24 of the preferred -- one of the alternatives would  
25 require 650 acre feet per year, in addition to the

1 water rights that LANL already has.

2 MR. BROWN: Joni, you're at five minutes  
3 now. There are four other people signed up, and then  
4 we are going to have quite a bit of time, so can I  
5 call on you after I get through those four and come  
6 back to you.

7 MS. ARENDS: I would like to finish my  
8 third point. Thank you.

9 MR. BROWN: Sure.

10 MS. ARENDS: The third claim is, "In the  
11 event of a facility accident at LANL, the chances of  
12 fatalities would also increase." If we go to summary  
13 page 8, S-81. Facility accidents -- and this is for  
14 the preferred alternative -- the consolidated  
15 plutonium center. "Accident with the highest  
16 consequences to the off-site population is the beyond  
17 evaluation basic earthquake and fire. Approximately  
18 26 latent cancer fatalities in the off-site  
19 population could result from such an accident.

20 Off-site maximally exposed individual, the MEI, would  
21 receive a dose of 87.5 ram. Statistically MEI would  
22 have one chance in 19 of a latent cancer fatality.

23 "When probabilities are taken into account,  
24 the accident with the highest risk is the explosion  
25 in a feed casting furnace. For this accident, the

1 latent cancer fatality risk to the maximally exposed  
2 individual would be approximately nine times ten to  
3 the minus four, or approximately one in 1,000. For  
4 the population, the latent cancer fatality risk would  
5 be 0.19 or approximately one in five."

6 In this sheet the claim is, "The preferred  
7 alternative seeks to replace a 60 year facility with  
8 modern, safer and a more environmentally friendly  
9 facility that further reduces the likelihood of  
10 accidents. Complex transformation envisions reducing  
11 LANL's nuclear operations footprint by nearly  
12 50 percent. Moreover a smaller, more secure, more  
13 modern, and more efficient facility, with less  
14 movement of nuclear materials, will decrease the  
15 already low risk of an accident and its potential  
16 effects."

17 So our question is, who is telling the  
18 truth? The NNSA or Los Alamos National Laboratory,  
19 specifically about these three issues -- air, water,  
20 and the seismic risk and the accident risk.

21 Now after these comments are over, I will  
22 be giving a presentation, Mr. Wyka and Mr. Holmes  
23 have agreed to allow me to give a presentation about  
24 the seismic risk with references to the Defense  
25 Nuclear Facility Safety Board.

1           MR. BROWN: So we will get on to the  
2 remaining four speakers.

3           MS. ARENDS: Okay, thank you.

4           MR. BROWN: Holly Beaumont is next and  
5 Rosalie Scimonelli will follow her.

6           MS. HOLLY BEAUMONT: Well, I would like to  
7 preface my statements by saying, I hope you will stay  
8 for Joni Arends' slide presentation. She always has  
9 extraordinary information to share. And I also want  
10 to say that I was here last evening. I'm Holly  
11 Beaumont with the New Mexico Conference of Churches.  
12 I'm a legislative advocate, and I'm a 22 year  
13 resident of Santa Fe. I was here last night for the  
14 hearings and decided that I would use that time just  
15 to listen, and it was really very helpful. I agree  
16 with those who have said that we need to be working  
17 together, and I hope there is a way for us to forge  
18 that kind of collaboration.

19           On March 1st in Santa Fe, the New Mexico  
20 Conference of Churches, Concerned Citizens for  
21 Nuclear Safety, Nuclear Watch, and Faithful Security  
22 sponsored a community event that began with a  
23 historic press conference that included Mayor Coss of  
24 Santa Fe, Mayor Maestas of Espanola, Governor Craig  
25 Quancello of the Picuris Pueblo, Alan Sanchez

1 speaking on behalf of Archbishop Sheehan and Bishops  
2 Pilate and Ramirez, and Barbara Duway of the  
3 Conference of Churches. And I refer to this as an  
4 historic event, because it is evidence of the growing  
5 grassroots movement to change the direction of our  
6 future in New Mexico.

7 We share a vision for New Mexico, as the  
8 epicenter for renewable and sustainable energy. We  
9 are encouraged by plans to establish the Solar Energy  
10 Research Park and Academy in Espanola, that was House  
11 Bill 660, and it was signed just last week by  
12 Governor Richardson, in spite of the fact that it  
13 appropriates nearly \$2 million, in a year when many  
14 worthy projects failed to be funded. The Solar  
15 Energy Research Park and Academy is an important step  
16 towards new economic development in northern New  
17 Mexico that is not dependent upon the nuclear weapons  
18 industry. We believe that our vision is shared by a  
19 growing number of state and congressional leaders,  
20 and statesmen like those that have been mentioned.  
21 That includes Henry Kissinger and Sam Nunn and  
22 William Perry and George Shultz.

23 Senator Sam Nunn refers to the elimination  
24 of all nuclear weapons as the climb to a high  
25 mountain and a climb that we must make. Nuclear

1 weapons may have served their purpose as a deterrent  
2 to war, however by embarking on the production of new  
3 nuclear pits in the United States, we continue to  
4 destabilize geo-political relations. We simply  
5 cannot defend our right to possess and produce  
6 nuclear weapons as essential to our national  
7 security, while we deny that same right to other  
8 nations.

9 Iran, which has not invaded another country  
10 for over a hundred years, is surrounded by nations  
11 that we have allowed to acquire nuclear weapons,  
12 including Israel and India and Pakistan. It is only  
13 common sense for the people of Iran to feel  
14 threatened and to consider nuclear weapons as  
15 important to their national security as we consider  
16 them to ours.

17 I have a quote from Pope John Paul II, that  
18 I would like to share with you. "The continual  
19 preparation for war, demonstrated by the production  
20 of ever more numerous powerful and sophisticated  
21 weapons in various countries, shows that there is a  
22 desire to be ready for war, and being ready means  
23 being able to start it. It also means taking the  
24 risk that sometime, somewhere, someone can set in  
25 motion the terrible mechanism of general destruction.

1 Let us" -- he goes on -- "not repeat the past, a past  
2 of violence and destruction. Let us embark upon the  
3 steep and difficult path of peace, the only path that  
4 befits human dignity, the only path that leads to the  
5 true fulfillment of human destiny, the only path to a  
6 future in which equity, justice, and solidarity are  
7 realities and not just distant dreams.

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

9 MS. BEAUMONT: We believe, as do many  
10 others, that nuclear weapons are rapidly becoming  
11 irrelevant. We believe that to save the labs, we  
12 must convert it from an industry that produces  
13 weapons of mass destruction to an industry that is  
14 life enhancing and benefits all of humankind.

15 One final quote from Eric Hoffer. "In a  
16 time of profound change, it is the learners who  
17 inherit the future. The learned find themselves  
18 beautifully equipped to live in a world that no  
19 longer exists." Thank you.

20 MR. BROWN: Rosalie is next, and she will  
21 be followed by Liviu Popa-Simil.

22 MS. ROSALIE SCIMONELLI: Good afternoon.  
23 My name is Rosalie Scimonelli. I am a new resident  
24 to this beautiful state of New Mexico. I live in Rio  
25 Rancho, and I guess I live in the downwind country,

1     although I haven't noticed it yet, but I have noticed  
2     all of the traffic accidents daily in Rio Rancho and  
3     throughout Albuquerque.

4             When my grandfathers arrived a hundred  
5     years ago to Ellis Island from Regi Calabria and  
6     Catania, Sicily, they brought with them a vision of  
7     hope, prosperity, love, and patriotism to this  
8     country that they passed down to their children,  
9     their grandchildren, and those have been passed down  
10    to their great grandchildren. They knew that  
11    education was the key out of poverty, prejudice, war,  
12    and they are looking down today, because I would like  
13    to tell you, apart from giving birth to the -- I have  
14    given birth to the three leaders of the 21st century,  
15    this is the greatest honor of my life to stand here  
16    before you in Los Alamos and express my views. I  
17    have waited a very long time for this.

18            The magnificent men of mental prowess of  
19    the Los Alamos National Laboratory hold the future of  
20    the planet in their very capable hands, and I would  
21    have it at no other place or with no other men. It  
22    made me very sad and frustrated these past two days  
23    to hear the disparaging remarks that they are not  
24    moral, that they only care about the money, and that  
25    they have not achieved anything except creating

1 nuclear weapons.

2           This is so far from the truth that it is  
3 appalling to me that you could even put these words  
4 out for everyone to hear. Their achievements, their  
5 degrees, their publications, their awards, would fill  
6 battleships. One in particular that I know and had  
7 the great privilege of being able to help mentor him,  
8 is the father of Basingham theory. He is the  
9 foremost statistician in this country. He is now  
10 retired. He has passed this legacy on to his  
11 star-studded son. He is the most moral and Christian  
12 man I have ever met in my entire life. He has lived  
13 his life for Christ, his family, and his country. We  
14 need to sit down together peacefully, without  
15 prejudice, without a biased opinion, without to me,  
16 nonsense that I have heard for two days.

17           I may be a little bit out of place, but I  
18 have to say this. You have made remarks that aren't  
19 too kind. Some of you activists remind me of  
20 two-year-olds that say no to everything, you don't  
21 listen, and you missed your naps. Our country is on  
22 a dangerous precipice. We are facing economic  
23 pollution, maybe another war. Do you want it in the  
24 hands of dictators? If you have ever been a student  
25 of history, Harry Truman said, "The buck stops here."

1 Well, folks, I like to tell you, the buck stops right  
2 here in Los Alamos at this national treasure.

3 MR. BROWN: You have a minute left.

4 MS. SCIMONELLI: Yes, sir.

5 We need to get together with these  
6 scientists and talk to them man to man. I invite you  
7 to take a course in calculus or physics to see what  
8 they have gone through their entire lives. They have  
9 dedicated their education -- excuse me. I have got  
10 to catch -- they have dedicated their knowledge to  
11 saving the planet. It doesn't take a rocket  
12 scientist to know that we need a new facility.

13 If you don't like it here, I invite you to  
14 move to Las Vegas. See how you like it there. Or  
15 maybe Los Angeles, or go up to the San Andreas Fault.  
16 This is a free country. Thank you again for your  
17 patience on my viewpoints, and as we say in New York  
18 and New Jersey, "You can't talk the talk until you  
19 walk the walk."

20 MR. BROWN: Liviu is next and Earl Marie  
21 Hanson will follow.

22 MR. LIVIU POPA-SIMIL: Good afternoon. I  
23 am talking on behalf of myself as a private person  
24 and a nuclear engineer. I don't know exactly how  
25 good the new weapons will be compared to the old

1 ones, but I really know that in research in the field  
2 of nuclear engineering is what matters for the future  
3 development of civilization. And now I want to say  
4 that in this morning, starting with this year was  
5 inaugurated a recession of 2008. And this recession  
6 is not only about mortgage crisis, credit crisis,  
7 maybe dot com crisis. It has very deep roots, and  
8 that's why I want to appreciate the initiative of the  
9 office of transformation, for hearing and maybe  
10 getting out our message, that they care more about  
11 researchers and research in the United States.

12 The facts are, after winning the Cold War,  
13 the people do not spend the time to learn why really  
14 we are winners, what makes the Russian system fail,  
15 and never repeat their errors. And the research was  
16 depleted and was decreased over the time, and now in  
17 our open market economy, the basis of the future  
18 United States economy have to be based on advanced  
19 products, on advanced research, and brains. And  
20 that's why I make an appeal to office of  
21 transformation and DOE, to treat more carefully all  
22 the reductions of facilities in order to give new  
23 jobs and the new restructuring for the staff to  
24 maintain the skills and knowledge. Not only that in  
25 an open market and to the hazardous combination of

1 the skills and talents, but find new alternative  
2 missions to put in value more their skills on a  
3 peaceful or a useful science for all the economy.

4 So finally I want to thank the office of  
5 transformation and DOE for having patience and  
6 listening to us, and to suggest a better approach and  
7 developing the change or the reduction of the  
8 fingerprint of nuclear weaponry by developing and  
9 stimulating the development of the nuclear power in  
10 full harmony with other energies for the economy of  
11 the planet and for world affairs. I hope that  
12 weapons will be never used, and usually this is a  
13 policy I do not enter, and I cannot advise. So thank  
14 you, and thank you for listening to me.

15 MR. BROWN: We were just conferring about  
16 getting a break.

17 MS. EARLE MARIE HANSON: I am Earle Marie  
18 Hanson, and I am speaking today here as a private  
19 citizen to register my strong opposition to the  
20 preferred alternative option of moving gas transfer  
21 systems, which is known as GTS responsibility, from  
22 Los Alamos to Sandia, and of moving tritium R & D  
23 support from Los Alamos to Savannah River.

24 I retired from Los Alamos National Lab in  
25 2003 after 27 years in the nuclear weapons program.

1 During my last 12 years, I led the Los Alamos complex  
2 21 lead laboratory program, identifying and  
3 developing the technologies and facilities required  
4 to support the nuclear weapons program of the 21st  
5 century. I later served as deputy program director  
6 for nuclear materials and stockpile management,  
7 assuring that Los Alamos maintain the needed  
8 materials capabilities and facilities in a safe and  
9 secure manner and met certain stockpile deliverables.

10 During the last five years of my career, I  
11 was division leader for engineering sciences and  
12 applications division, which was the weapons  
13 engineering division responsible for the oversight  
14 and evaluation of the stockpile surveillance program,  
15 weapons engineering design, high explosive  
16 fabrication for local tests, GTS design and testing,  
17 tritium R & D, and some fabrication and support of  
18 the stockpile. I only mention these items to impress  
19 upon you that I am knowledgeable of what it takes to  
20 maintain a safe and reliable nuclear deterrent, and I  
21 believe that it is essential to do so.

22 I agree with the need to reduce the number  
23 of nuclear weapons in the stockpile, and I agree with  
24 the hope that we never, ever use them. I also agree  
25 that we need to create a smaller, more cost effective

1 and fully responsible nuclear complex. On the whole,  
2 I support the preferred alternative for complex  
3 transformation as outlined in this meeting. But I  
4 think the preferred alternative to move GTS to Sandia  
5 and tritium R & D to Savannah River are totally  
6 wrong. It's very short sighted from a programmatic  
7 perspective and counter to the goal of maintaining  
8 the safety and reliability of the stockpile and our  
9 ability to respond to issues in an agile and flexible  
10 manner.

11 The gas transfer system technology is a  
12 very important part of maintaining the reliability of  
13 the stockpile. It's a flexible, cost effective, and  
14 relatively quick way of addressing some unforeseen  
15 problems that might arise in our aging stockpile, and  
16 I would be happy to provide examples of this in a  
17 classified venue. Because of its critical importance  
18 for the stockpile, it would be best if GTS design  
19 technology could be maintained at both Sandia and Los  
20 Alamos, but barring that option, it's essential to  
21 maintain this technology at Los Alamos.

22 Los Alamos has responsibility for the  
23 majority of the booth systems, both today and future  
24 stockpile. We have capability in all of the GTS  
25 technologies in the stockpile and have been

1 responsible for most of the booth systems that have  
2 been fabricated in recent years and are planned for  
3 the near future. We have excellent in-house  
4 facilities for GTS R & D using both hydrogen and  
5 tritium. We have expertise not just to design  
6 systems, but to troubleshoot any anomalies that might  
7 arise in surveillance testing, and have demonstrated  
8 the flexibility to respond to these findings.

9           The GTS facilities at Los Alamos are modern  
10 and functional. It would not be cost effective to  
11 dismantle them and try to establish them at another  
12 site. To be poised to address any stockpile problems  
13 that might arise, one must have a trained and  
14 dedicated staff that is involved in real time, R & D,  
15 working with the technologies, improving surveillance  
16 techniques and understanding the materials and aging  
17 issues. Working with the many tritium R & D storage  
18 samples that are here at Los Alamos helps to maintain  
19 this expertise.

20           Savannah River is good at production  
21 activities, such as filling bottles and conducting  
22 routine surveillance testing, but they are not as  
23 effective at doing one of a kind R & D experiments,  
24 such as are needed to address possible stockpile  
25 anomalies. GTS design engineering and tritium R & D

1 work hand and hand at Los Alamos to deliver a  
2 superior product. The cost of maintaining GTS and  
3 tritium R & D capabilities is really quite small  
4 relative to the overall cost of running the nuclear  
5 weapons complex.

6 MR. BROWN: About one minute left.

7 MS. HANSON: Yet the importance of this  
8 work should not be underestimated with respect to  
9 maintaining the safety and reliability of our nuclear  
10 deterrent. In closing, I respectfully request that  
11 NNSA reconsider their proposed alternative for GTS  
12 and maintain both GTS design and testing capability  
13 and tritium R & D capability at Los Alamos.

14 MR. BROWN: We are going to take a five  
15 minute break at this point. We have a couple of  
16 speakers left and then Joni Arends will have her  
17 presentation as well, so we will be back in five  
18 minutes.

19 (A recess was taken.)

20 MR. BROWN: We will resume this afternoon's  
21 hearing if folks will take their seats. We have  
22 several signed up speakers pending, and in addition,  
23 if there are folks who would like to add comments, I  
24 will be inviting them afterwards. So let me indicate  
25 who else is signed up. We have David Thomson.

1           David, you are next, if you will step up to  
2 the podium. Thank you. And Carol Burns will follow  
3 David.

4           MR. DAVID THOMSON: I am a physicist who  
5 joined LANL in 1951. I worked full time in nuclear  
6 weapons testing, neutron and plasma physics, achieved  
7 a PhD in 1960, then worked in high explosive driven  
8 systems, atomic physics, the nuclear weapons program  
9 office, and magnetic fusion. I retired in 1990, and  
10 have subsequently been a lab affiliate and/or a  
11 guest. Since retirement, I have concentrated on  
12 nuclear arms control issues, both for the lab and as  
13 a private citizen.

14           The views I give here are strictly my own.  
15 Firstly, I believe it is urgent that the US  
16 government seek new multi-lateral international  
17 treaties that will enhance the NPT and in balanced  
18 and fully verifiable stages, bring nuclear warhead  
19 inventories of all warheads, deployed and stored, for  
20 the US and Russia, down from the many thousands  
21 presently on hand to about 300 warheads each.  
22 France, UK, and China should be limited to no more  
23 than a few dozen. All other nations should adhere to  
24 zero nuclear weapons as called for in the NPT.

25           Secondly, I believe that LANL should be

1 funded to carry on synergistic nuclear research  
2 programs that will enable the laboratory to retain  
3 its expertise in the knowledge of nuclear weapons  
4 design and characteristics so that any future needed  
5 capabilities may be reconstituted as international  
6 threats may dictate. Hopefully LANL's weapons  
7 capabilities may be retained without nuclear testing  
8 so that the US may ratify the CTBT and work more  
9 urgently for its implementation.

10 Thirdly, I believe that LANL's long  
11 standing and effective programs of research in  
12 nuclear safeguards for the IAEA, for space based  
13 observations such as Vela, for nuclear warhead  
14 verification and related verification technologies  
15 should be continued and enhanced.

16 Fourthly, I believe that LANL's nuclear  
17 research program should include both basic science as  
18 well as goal oriented research in nuclear energy  
19 production, including both fission reactor concepts  
20 and fusion energy. LANL's magnetic research program  
21 should be restored to its 1990 level. Nuclear energy  
22 research provides the right mix of scientific talents  
23 to synergize with the nuclear weapons knowledge  
24 capabilities urged above.

25 The DOE complex transformation program, as

1 I have heard it explained for these hearings, appears  
2 to me to be in conformity with these goals. LANL may  
3 retain a pit production capability for research and  
4 replacement purposes, but operations budgets for such  
5 work should not exceed 20 percent of the total LANL  
6 research budget except in extreme emergencies.

7 I thank you for this opportunity to express  
8 my views. I hope to discuss these issues in more  
9 detail in appropriate venues. Thank you.

10 MR. BROWN: Carol Burns is next.

11 MS. CAROL BURNS: I want to start out by  
12 thanking you for holding these hearings. It's an  
13 important venue for that. So my name is Carol Burns  
14 and I am a second generation Los Alamos resident and  
15 native of Los Alamos.

16 I support the preferred alternative and  
17 wish to see it endorsed by the record of decision.  
18 But I am currently employed by Los Alamos National  
19 Laboratory, but I really want to reflect more on the  
20 experience I gained through working at the Office of  
21 Science and Technology Policy, where I had luxury for  
22 a year of reading and studying and learning and  
23 writing about the broader area of nuclear defense and  
24 how we manage the resource and the threat of nuclear  
25 materials.

1           I believe the preferred alternative  
2 outlined for complex transformation will support a  
3 number of important goals. First, the impacts of  
4 complex transformation will support stockpile  
5 reduction. We have heard a lot about capability  
6 based deterrent and how it's going to lead to  
7 confidence in our abilities that will actually speed  
8 our path to disarmament. Old facilities are  
9 difficult and expensive to maintain. I am a group  
10 leader, I know. It's in everybody's best interest to  
11 reduce operational costs through consolidation and  
12 reduction of the overall footprint of our nuclear  
13 weapons enterprise.

14           Modern construction standards will greatly  
15 improve our safety and security posture and allow us  
16 to execute our work more effectively, protecting  
17 workers, which I am responsible for, and members of  
18 the public. But beyond the weapons program, complex  
19 transformation is going to facilitate the maintenance  
20 of knowledge and skills of importance to a broader  
21 range of national security goals that I spent so much  
22 time thinking about. There are many worthwhile goals  
23 in national and international security, relying upon  
24 maintaining expertise and skills that we just built  
25 originally for our strategic deterrent.

1           In nonproliferation programs, it's very  
2     difficult to detect possible points of material  
3     diversion and cooperative safeguards monitoring if  
4     you don't understand nuclear materials processing.

5     In Homeland Security programs, it is very difficult  
6     to establish the requirements for detection systems  
7     at our borders and our ports, if you don't have the  
8     knowledge of weapons and materials to know what is  
9     dangerous that you are looking for. In managing  
10    nuclear materials worldwide, it's very difficult to  
11    judge where a smuggled material comes from that you  
12    have intercepted, and therefore, you have to go plug  
13    a hole if you don't have the capability to conduct  
14    chemical or materials analysis of samples.

15           So these goals that I have outlined have  
16    some pretty broad bipartisan support. Reproducing  
17    all these capabilities completely separately creates,  
18    in effect, a new nuclear weapons enterprise. And  
19    trying to do that outside of the footprint of current  
20    complex may not even be possible and is certainly  
21    going to be much expensive. So we have all heard a  
22    lot of talk lately from Congress and from  
23    non-governmental organizations about the development  
24    of a comprehensive nuclear defense policy that's  
25    going to meld our approach to strategic deterrent

1 with these more modern elements or faces of nuclear  
2 defense.

3 It's going to be a pretty interesting  
4 debate, and I don't think any of us right now can  
5 predict the outcome 10 or 20 years down the road, but  
6 what is clear is that physical transformation of the  
7 complex is required regardless of the outcome of  
8 those debates, and I believe the preferred option  
9 provides the most flexible approach to accommodate  
10 these future goals.

11 MR. BROWN: That concludes the list of  
12 folks who signed up to speak. So let me ask if there  
13 is anyone else in the audience who has not spoken yet  
14 who would like to add a comment. We have a person in  
15 back. Please come forward. Anyone else?

16 Joni, do you mind if I take one?

17 If you can identify yourself for the court  
18 reporter.

19 MR. JON VENTURA: Good afternoon. My name  
20 is Jon Ventura. My wife and I have been staff  
21 members of the weapons program at Los Alamos National  
22 Lab for almost four years. We are residents of Los  
23 Alamos County.

24 I have carefully read the documents  
25 associated with the preferred alternative, and I

1 believe it to be the best plan to ensure the  
2 technical and scientific excellence of Los Alamos  
3 National Laboratory for decades to come. Therefore,  
4 I endorse the preferred alternative and hope to see  
5 it incorporated in the record of decision by the  
6 department.

7 My remarks today, however, will focus on  
8 the discussion that has taken place over the last  
9 several days across the state of New Mexico. While  
10 laboratory staff has provided facts about the  
11 laboratory's work and how it contributes to US  
12 national security in the broadest sense, we have  
13 been, at times, pilloried by our opponents in the  
14 most disparaging terms, terms so offensive I will not  
15 repeat them here today.

16 The men and women at Los Alamos are the  
17 most dedicated and talented people working to  
18 preserve, protect, and defend the blessings of  
19 liberty we all enjoy. Our contributions have helped  
20 preserve world peace and prosperity for more than 65  
21 years, both with nuclear and non-nuclear  
22 contributions. Let me provide a few examples of the  
23 initiatives we are involved in.

24 LANL scientists are developing detailed  
25 computer models to track and predict locally,

1 nationally, and globally spreading disease pandemics,  
2 including Avian flu and smallpox. Lab staff, working  
3 with our colleagues at Lawrence Livermore, developed  
4 and deployed the system BASIS used to detect  
5 pathogens such as Anthrax at the Salt Lake Olympics,  
6 superbowls, and World Series. Lab engineers are  
7 working with the Department of Homeland Security on a  
8 nuclear detection system for the Port Authority of  
9 New York and New Jersey, including the lab's airborne  
10 detection system.

11           LANL, for the past 40 years, has trained  
12 nearly all of the international atomic energy  
13 safeguard inspectors. LANL technologies including  
14 advanced body armor and the Angel Fire Combat  
15 Surveillance system are at work today protecting US  
16 troops, who, through their heroism, are helping to  
17 secure the freedoms guaranteed by the US  
18 constitution. This is the kind of work we do at Los  
19 Alamos. This work most people simply do not know  
20 about, and we are able to do it because of our core  
21 national security responsibilities entrusted to us by  
22 the government. Thank you for listening to me.

23           MR. BROWN: Thank you.

24           Is there anyone else who would like to add  
25 a comment?

1           Okay, Joni.

2           MS. JONI ARENDS: Thank you for this  
3 opportunity again. I would like to finish up my  
4 comments.

5           Specifically we have concerns about the  
6 continuation of the open burning, open detonation  
7 activities at Los Alamos.

8           VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: I can't hear. Can  
9 you turn the mike up a little bit?

10          MS. ARENDS: Is it working?

11          VOICE FROM THE FLOOR: It just needs to be  
12 louder.

13          MR. BROWN: Go ahead, turn it up a little  
14 bit.

15          MS. ARENDS: Thank you.

16          Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety are  
17 very concerned about the continued open burning, open  
18 detonation activities at both Los Alamos National  
19 Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratories. We are  
20 concerned about the open detonation, open burning of  
21 these materials, depleted uranium high explosives,  
22 solvents, and other radionuclides associated with  
23 these activities. There is not adequate monitoring  
24 around Los Alamos National Laboratory to detect these  
25 contaminants. These practices must be stopped.

1 There are too many people in the surrounding  
2 communities that have been impacted by these open air  
3 detonations and burning activities.

4 We also have concerns about groundwater,  
5 and I would like to submit the National Academies of  
6 Science report, the Plans and Practices for the  
7 Groundwater Protection at Los Alamos National  
8 Laboratory. This was released by the National  
9 Academies of Science last June, and specifically I  
10 would like to make two quotes for the record.

11 The first one is on page 49. Where the  
12 National Academies of Science did the review of the  
13 groundwater monitoring program at Los Alamos. And on  
14 page 49 they say, "Many if not all of the wells  
15 drilled into the regional aquifer under the  
16 hydrogeologic work plan appear to be compromised in  
17 their ability to produce water samples that are  
18 representative of ambient groundwater for the purpose  
19 of monitoring." This indicates that Los Alamos does  
20 not have the necessary monitoring network to tell us  
21 what's in the groundwater, what's in the regional  
22 aquifer, and what's moving toward Santa Fe's drinking  
23 water supply.

24 Sixty percent of the recharge for the  
25 Buckman well field comes from Pajarito Plateau, comes

1 from this plateau. Forty percent of Santa Fe's  
2 drinking water comes from the Buckman well field.  
3 Plutonium 238 has already been found in Buckman well  
4 number one, and it was reported in the 2006 Santa Fe  
5 Drinking Water Quality Report. Last May, the New  
6 Mexico Environment Department reported plutonium and  
7 other radionuclides associated with nuclear weapons  
8 production and manufacturing, in an old river  
9 channel, a river slough north of the proposed Buckman  
10 direct diversion project, a drinking water project  
11 for Santa Fe, directly across the river from Los  
12 Alamos. That investigation is ongoing. So the  
13 contaminants from LANL have already reached Santa  
14 Fe's drinking water supply.

15 The other quote in this report is another  
16 quote about, that Los Alamos does not have the  
17 required groundwater monitoring network, and that's  
18 on page 60. In this report it says, "Most or all  
19 wells into the regional aquifer at LANL are flawed  
20 for the purpose of monitoring." So those are two  
21 important statements with regard to what the National  
22 Academies of Science determined about operations.

23 So under DOE order 435.1 and 450.1, DOE is  
24 required to have a monitoring network. They were  
25 required to have a network of groundwater monitoring

1 wells by December 31, 2005. They do not have that  
2 network. Because they don't have an adequate network  
3 that is capable of detecting contaminants, all  
4 plutonium pit production work should be stopped at  
5 this laboratory. That's reason No. 1.

6 The second reason is that recently the  
7 Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board reported that  
8 there is a 50 percent increase in the G force of any  
9 earthquake seismic activity at Los Alamos. And when  
10 we compare the photos, the schematics in the 1999  
11 Final Environmental Impact Statement, the Site Wide  
12 Environmental Impact Statement for Los Alamos, we see  
13 not as many faults as reported in the 2006 draft,  
14 LANL SWEIS. There are many more faults, many more  
15 faults. There are many more identified faults in the  
16 area of TA-3, TA-55, and the areas in between. Those  
17 are the areas where the CMR building is located as  
18 well as the CMRR facility and TA-55.

19 Specifically the defense --

20 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry. You are at about  
21 five minutes now, if you can wrap up fairly soon.

22 MS. ARENDS: Yes.

23 MR. BROWN: Thanks so much.

24 MR. ARENDS: The 2006 draft LANL SWEIS  
25 made statements based on a draft probabilistic

1 seismic hazard analysis, and when that report was  
2 finalized in 2007, the scientist that did this  
3 report, it is called the Update of the Probabilistic  
4 Seismic Hazard Analysis and Development of Seismic  
5 Design Ground Motions at LANL. The author said,  
6 "Most seismic activity is along the Pajarito fault  
7 system, but detailed mapping and displacement  
8 measurements along this fault have not been  
9 performed. The field studies are essential to  
10 understand seismic danger to LANL operations." They  
11 listed ten recommendations, and we don't believe that  
12 any of those recommendations have been implemented at  
13 the laboratory.

14 We are very concerned about the fact that  
15 there is a 50 percent increase in a possible seismic  
16 force for these facilities, and that's another reason  
17 that all nuclear weapons work at Los Alamos should be  
18 stopped. Okay.

19 So here is for the record, and in response  
20 to the workers that have spoken, we are here to talk  
21 about the need for transformation of the mission, and  
22 we are here to help make that transformation. We  
23 want to see the laboratory -- the scientists at Los  
24 Alamos National Laboratory have the scientific  
25 expertise to deal with the radionuclides, the

1 hazardous materials, the toxic materials that were  
2 created as a result of nuclear weapons development,  
3 research, testing, manufacturing, and we need to call  
4 on your expertise to deal with the cleanup issues,  
5 the restorations, the remediation that needs to take  
6 place.

7           No more contaminants can be transported  
8 through these canyon systems to our drinking water  
9 supplies. Los Alamos County has already turned off  
10 two of their drinking water wells because of the  
11 perception of contamination -- tritium and  
12 perchlorate. We want to help the lab figure out, how  
13 do we get these contaminants out of the water. If  
14 you can figure out how to separate 235 from 238, you  
15 can figure out how to get these contaminants out of  
16 the water. So we want to support you in these  
17 efforts, but we need to bring up these gory details  
18 so that these changes can be made. We need your  
19 expertise to be able to clean up these facilities,  
20 and I thank you for all of your time today.

21           MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.

22           Thank you. Let me ask again if there are  
23 any further comments to add? We are scheduled to  
24 stay in session until 3:00. If anybody else wants to  
25 add a comment, I will mention that there is another

1 meeting this evening in Santa Fe, and we have to  
2 break down the electronics here, get the posters,  
3 everything packed up, transported, and on display in  
4 Santa Fe in something like two hours. So I think  
5 folks will begin breaking down some things. We will  
6 remain available -- the court reporter, myself, and  
7 Ted will remain available if anybody does want to add  
8 any comment, but there may be some ancillary  
9 activity.

10 So we will recess now, and if you have  
11 anything to add, just let us know. Thanks very much.

12 (A recess was taken between 2:29 p.m. to  
13 2:58 p.m.)

14 MR. BROWN: It is 3:00 in the afternoon. I  
15 am reconvening the meeting and asking if any member  
16 of the public wishes to add further comment. Noting  
17 that no one is expressing an interest to provide any  
18 additional statements, this meeting is officially  
19 adjourned.

20 (The meeting concluded at 2:58 p.m.)  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

1                                   COMPLEX TRANSFORMATION  
 2                                   DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMMATIC  
 3                                   ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (SPEIS)  
 4                                   PUBLIC HEARING, PUBLIC COMMENT PORTION  
 5                                   March 13, 2008

6  
 7  
 8  
 9                                   REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

10                                 I, Sally Peters, RPR, CCR #57, Certified  
 11                                 Court Reporter in the State of New Mexico, do hereby  
 12                                 certify that the foregoing pages constitute a true  
 13                                 transcript of proceedings had in the matter herein  
 14                                 stated.

15                                 In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set  
 16                                 my hand on March 24, 2008.

17  
 18  
 19  
 20                                   \_\_\_\_\_  
                                   SALLY PETERS, RPR, CCR #57  
                                   License Expires: 12/31/08  
 21                                   500 Marquette, NW, Suite 280  
                                   Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102