

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 13, 2008
Genoveva Chavez Community Center
3221 Rodeo Road
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87507

REPORTED BY: Jan A. Williams, RPR, CCR 14
Bean & Associates, Inc.
Professional Court Reporting Service
500 Marquette, Northwest, Suite 280
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
(6045A) JAW

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

7 Please step up to the microphone over there.
8 When your name is called, introduce yourself,
9 providing an organization or affiliation where
10 appropriate. If you have a written version of your
11 comments, please hand those to the court reporter when
12 you've completed your remarks.

13 I will call two names at a time, the first of
14 the speaker and the second of the person to follow.
15 And if that second person, if they're seated in the
16 back, can walk a bit to the front, we can save a
17 little time.

18 In view of the number of people who have
19 indicated an interest in speaking tonight, please
20 confine your remarks to three minutes. I realize
21 that's a very short time. However, with the number of
22 folks who have signed up, even at three minutes, we
23 will be running close to over time.

24 And folks often have either have to work
25 early, they've got babysitters, that sort of thing.

1 So in order to allow everyone who is taking the time
2 to come out here and wishes to speak, please summarize
3 your statements, recognizing that written comments and
4 verbal comments will count the same. So again if you
5 can summarize your key points.

6 Ted Wyka will be serving as the hearing
7 officer for the Department of Energy during the formal
8 comment period. And I will be giving you a notice
9 when you have one minute left. I did hear again a few
10 cell phones go off. So if you haven't put yours on
11 silence yet, please do so.

12 So with that by way of introduction, let me
13 call on our first speaker, Mike Anastasio. And he
14 will be followed by James Schiff.

15 MR. ANASTASIO: I'm Michael Anastasio and I'm
16 the director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory. I
17 want to encourage the NNSA to adopt the preferred
18 alternative and incorporate that into their record of
19 decision.

20 But as a resident of Santa Fe, I want to also
21 reassure the community, reassure them first that on
22 the national level that this preferred alternative
23 provides key steps that will allow this country to
24 further reduce our stockpile of nuclear weapons,
25 reduce it beyond almost a factor of two that we've

1 done this decade and do that through improved
2 efficiencies and adaptability in our nuclear weapons
3 enterprise. And you've heard some of that description
4 here tonight.

5 I would also like to reassure you that for
6 those of us here in Northern New Mexico, that the
7 preferred alternative provides key steps and
8 enhancements that allows the laboratory to further
9 improve the safety, the security, and the stewardship
10 of the environment at the laboratory in Los Alamos.

11 And, for example, in the preferred
12 alternative, we'll be reducing the nuclear facility
13 footprint at the laboratory by about a factor of two.
14 All the above requires the best in science and
15 engineering. And I just wanted to also say that I'm
16 committed personally to maintaining at Los Alamos
17 National Laboratory this laboratory as a world class
18 scientific institution.

19 And with the base of science that's required
20 to carry out this preferred alternative, that allows
21 us to further advance our science for other
22 applications, for things like nonproliferation, to
23 further understand the global climate, to develop new
24 and alternative measures, a means of energy
25 production, and to advance our human health.

1 I believe and I'm convinced personally that
2 the laboratory and the community have a shared faith,
3 that each of us depend on the success of the other.
4 And I must say I've been working hard since I've been
5 here to make that a reality.

6 So that we can all be proud of the science
7 that's done at Los Alamos National Laboratory and how
8 it's brought forward for the benefit of this great
9 country. Thank you very much.

10 MR. BROWN: Our next speaker is James Schiff.
11 Justin Olson will be following.

12 MR. SCHIFF: Good evening, ladies and
13 gentlemen. My name is Jim Schiff and I'm the current
14 acting general manager at the Bishop's Lodge here in
15 Santa Fe, Santa Fe's oldest resort.

16 The Bishop's Lodge Ranch, Resort, and Spa is
17 one of Santa Fe's hotels that has hosted many Sandia
18 and Los Alamos National Lab meetings. Each and every
19 one of these meetings has brought ongoing support to
20 the New Mexico economy by employing local associates,
21 hosting international visitors, and has brought
22 national exposure to businesses in Santa Fe and
23 throughout the state.

24 We support both the DOE and NNSA initiatives
25 and the ongoing continuing positive economic impacts

1 for Los Alamos National Labs here in New Mexico.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. BROWN: Our next speaker is Justin Olson.

4 And Chris Lewis will follow.

5 MR. OLSON: Holmes, I'd like to turn my time
6 over to Joni Arends of CCNA, Concerned Citizens of
7 Nuclear Safety.

8 MR. BROWN: All right.

9 MR. OLSON: Thank you very much.

10 MS. ARENDS: Good evening, everyone. This
11 may sound like a good proposal. But I think it's
12 important for folks to know that right now the lab is
13 allowed to produce, manufacture 20 pits per year. And
14 one of the proposals in this document says that they
15 want to produce up to 200 pits per year. So let me
16 just tell you some facts about the impacts of this
17 facility, this proposal.

18 One is if they go to the maximum amount of
19 200 pits per year, they're going to exceed their water
20 rights by 10 percent. 212 million gallons per year,
21 that's 650 acre-feet per year. So they're going to go
22 shopping for water rights. That's going to impact us
23 all.

24 It's also important to know for the Buchman,
25 for our water supply, 40 percent of our water comes

1 from the Buchman well field. Sixty percent of the
2 recharge from the Buchman well field comes from the
3 Pajarito plateau where the laboratory is located.
4 Last summer the City of Santa Fe reported
5 plutonium-238 in the Buchman well No. 1 which is the
6 well closest to the Rio Grande.

7 In May 2007 the New Mexico Environment
8 Department released a report saying that it is a
9 problem. The New Mexico Environment Department
10 reported last May plutonium, americium, and other
11 contaminants associated with the nuclear weapons
12 production in old river slew north of the proposed
13 Buchman site.

14 So the contamination is already off-site.
15 And we need to address those issues. And we need to
16 rely on the scientists at the laboratory. We need the
17 Department of Energy to make cleanup restoration,
18 remediation, the top priority.

19 These scientists are the scientists that
20 created many of these contaminants that have no
21 standards whatsoever. DOE is self-regulating for many
22 of these contaminants. So we need the expertise of
23 the scientists to figure out how do we get these
24 contaminants out of the soil, out of the air, and out
25 of our water.

1 And then with regard to the seismic issues,
2 in 1999 in the final environmental impact statement
3 for LANL, there's a graph of the seismic activity, the
4 faults for the laboratory. And when you look at the
5 2006 draft LANL SWEIS, there's many more faults that
6 have been found in the area of the nuclear weapons
7 manufacturing facilities.

8 The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board
9 reported a 50 percent increase in the seismic -- the
10 force of the seismic -- let me start over.

11 If there's a seismic event at the laboratory,
12 it could be 50 percent more strength. So like if we
13 have a curve of the G force, it's going to be
14 stronger, it's going to be sharper, we're going to
15 have -- those buildings were not necessarily designed
16 for those kinds of events.

17 So what we're saying for Concerns Citizens
18 for Nuclear Safety is that they can't be doing any
19 weapons, nuclear weapons manufacturing at the
20 laboratory because the buildings that they're using
21 right now are not designed for that purpose. I wanted
22 to thank the DOE and Mr. Wyka, thank you very much.

23 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. Our next
24 speaker is Chris Lewis and Elana Sue St. Pierre will
25 be next.

1 MR. LEWIS: Hi. I'm a little afraid so if
2 this comes off as being unpolished and unprofessional,
3 please grant me a little bit of mercy.

4 My name is Chris Lewis, my father was Daniel
5 Jackson Lewis. He worked in pit production at Los
6 Alamos National Lab. Despite what everybody has said,
7 they were still making them back when he was exposed
8 to 26 rems from a plutonium gas leak in 1998.

9 We were lied to, my family has been
10 threatened with death threats basically to keep our
11 mouths shut. So I almost didn't come here tonight.
12 I'm still a little bit afraid. We've had three CPS,
13 Child Protection Services, investigations over
14 nothing. Each time they admitted that there was
15 nothing, but somebody called in basically because of
16 this.

17 I didn't find out about it. But my mother
18 just went into the beryllium and plutonium workers
19 reimbursement thing. And nobody bothered telling me.
20 I had given her the information I had gotten from my
21 father. The lab's current thing right now is that
22 there's only five -- he only received five rems.

23 I got it from Patrick Phehan who is a
24 radiologist at St. Vincent's. He told me specifically
25 it was 25 or 26, I can't remember the exact number.

1 He said that that was probably what caused my father
2 to die. But the lab refused to tell him about it.

3 We didn't find out until November of 2000,
4 almost a year and a half afterwards, that he had been
5 exposed at all. And when he was coughing up the
6 pieces of the tumor and the parts of his lungs that
7 came out, he threw them up on my body, when we went
8 through it, everybody had lied to us completely about
9 it.

10 So I just I guess what I'm asking here is to
11 me all the stuff that has gone on at the lab, nobody
12 is being honest about what's going on. You know, it
13 would be okay if -- I'm not against nuclear weapons, I
14 have worked in PF-4 myself.

15 I'm not against anything about that, I think
16 we need to defend ourselves. But I think there seems
17 to be an incredible lack of honesty. Like a lot of
18 people here, like the last one that came up, that
19 there are other accidents that nobody is willing to
20 talk about.

21 My father died from that. He'll never meet
22 his grandchildren. And we didn't do anything wrong.
23 We're good American citizens. All we wanted was
24 honesty. We have been denied that. I've gotten death
25 threats, the kids have gotten threatened at school.

1 My stepson got arrested for supposedly
2 pulling a knife on a kid. When we went down to the
3 Santa Fe District Attorney, the first word out of her
4 mouth was what group are you with. I'm not a part of
5 any group. All I did was tell people about what
6 happened to my dad. And all I want is honesty and
7 justice.

8 And that's what I'm asking from you. I'm not
9 asking you to shut down all the nuclear production. I
10 just want people to be honest about what's going on up
11 there. My father didn't have to die.

12 I talked to a lawyer in Ohio that had worked
13 for uranium workers up in that area. I didn't know
14 there was uranium up in Ohio. But the guy told me
15 that my father had about a 50 percent chance of
16 survival. He would be alive today.

17 To me if you don't change something at the
18 lab about the reporting standards, especially the
19 games that people play about hurting people. I was
20 harassed at Bethlehem Lutheran Church by our reverend.
21 He worked as a guard, Greg Easler.

22 He came up and in front of other people at
23 Los Alamos Mesa Public Library told me that my father
24 deserved to die. Can you imagine what kind of pain
25 that would put somebody through. My father didn't

1 deserve to die. He's a veteran, he's done all sorts
2 of things for the United States.

3 Our family goes all the way back to the
4 Revolutionary War. We have never asked to just be
5 killed. All we asked is for the honesty that this
6 government and this democracy was supposed to be
7 founded on. And that's all I'm asking, is that no
8 matter what alternative you do, that you will be
9 honest with the people so we avoid this, so nobody
10 else has to die like my dad did.

11 MR. BROWN: Paul Dunn will follow Elana.

12 MS. ST. PIERRE: My name is Elana Sue
13 St. Pierre. It's a good day to be alive on the
14 planet. And thank you for being here so that we can
15 speak.

16 MR. BROWN: Can you all hear in the back?

17 MS. ST. PIERRE: Can you hear me now?

18 It's a good day to be alive on the planet.
19 Thank you for all coming. I am personally concerned
20 because I heard a lot of well-thought out plans. But
21 I have not heard how to keep this community safe.

22 What is the footprint that we are already
23 living with? Here is Los Alamos. They run down. The
24 river is here. There's a contamination site right
25 here that in October our city councilors asked what

1 will happen if we get a washing rain.

2 We're now in the washing rain time. And it's
3 still there. So I'm asking help now. What do we do
4 about the contamination site that's here with the
5 existing contaminants.

6 Our Clean Water Act looks at surface water.
7 It does not include plutonium, cesium, tritium,
8 strontium. Our clean drinking water on this hand does
9 not look at plutonium, arsenium, cesium, strontium,
10 tritium, DOE looks at that. It's not supposed to be
11 in our drinking water. It's in our drinking water
12 now.

13 Please, please help us. I am here to speak
14 for the pregnant women and the children with whom I
15 work. I am an occupational therapist. I work with
16 this community's most vulnerable and medically fragile
17 people. And there is nothing here to protect us.

18 EPA safe water standards only protect a
19 154-pound male. Please, please protect us. The
20 security that I want is for my health. And the fetus
21 that grows in the womb, in the waters, the living
22 waters, the reproductive organs affect three
23 generations.

24 Please protect us. I want true
25 transformation. I want clean air. I want clean

1 water, living, healthy water. I want a research lab
2 that knows what to do with the waste, because it is
3 wasting our community. Please hear this and know our
4 security depends on you for the next three
5 generations. Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: Scott Kovac will follow.

7 MR. DUNN: I'm Paul Dunn and I'm here
8 representing the Dunn family of Santa Fe, New Mexico.
9 I've lived in Santa Fe for 23 years. I've worked at
10 Los Alamos National Laboratory for 23 years. Before
11 that I worked at Rocky Flats for two years.

12 What I can tell you is from my perspective
13 the lab is doing this safer than any other location in
14 this country. And what forced me to come up here and
15 speak tonight, this is about reduction, it's about
16 reduction in nuclear weapons, it's about reduction in
17 square footage.

18 And I hope that in my lifetime I'll be able
19 to come back here and say we don't need nuclear
20 weapons at all in this country. On the contrary, we
21 do need them right now. Nuclear weapons protect every
22 single person in this room every single night. Okay.

23 MR. BROWN: Let people finish. There are
24 plenty of folks that will talk on all sides of the
25 issue.

1 MR. DUNN: My final point, we're all going to
2 be paying our taxes here in about a month. As a
3 taxpayer in this country, the last thing I want to do
4 is spend a whole lot more money to move this plutonium
5 research R&D that this country needs out of Los Alamos
6 to a different location. Thank you.

7 MR. BROWN: Okay. Scott Kovac. Sylvia
8 Vergara will follow Scott.

9 MR. KOVAC: Thank you. Now that Los Alamos
10 National Laboratory has been designated as the
11 preferred site for permanent pit production, what else
12 comes along with this dubious distinction. Permanent
13 spending of taxpayer money, permanent increased risk
14 to the public, permanent increased water use,
15 permanent increased waste production, and permanent
16 profits.

17 Expanding pit production may also be a
18 permanently wrong direction, constricting the
19 opportunity for needed mission diversification at the
20 lab to address today's critical national security
21 needs such as weapons of mass destruction,
22 proliferation, maritime port security, energy and
23 dependence, and global climate change.

24 The total operating costs for plutonium pit
25 production at LANL will be around a half a billion

1 dollars a year. This does not include facility
2 construction and upgrade costs. This money could be
3 much better spent for cleanup and other needed -- more
4 needed programs.

5 The preferred alternative would generate 575
6 cubic yards of radioactive TRU waste per year. This
7 is triple the amount that LANL produced in 2005. It
8 is proposed that this increase in TRU waste be
9 packaged and shipped to the Waste Isolation Pilot
10 Plant in Southern New Mexico for disposal.

11 However, WIPP is already 30 percent full or
12 so from past bomb making. And the remaining space at
13 WIPP is already all accounted for. There is currently
14 no room for added TRU waste. The transgenic waste
15 generated from plutonium production at LANL has no
16 disposal path. Where will this bomb making waste go?

17 I suggest that this environmental impact
18 statement come forward and truthfully say where this
19 waste will go. Otherwise it should be withdrawn.

20 MR. BROWN: Francine Lindberg will follow
21 Sylvia.

22 MS. VERGARA: Hello, my name is Sylvia
23 Vergara and I have a small farm in the Embudo Valley.
24 Water is very important. And I do want to ask you to
25 go to this web site, it's very important so everybody

1 write this down. Www dot whistleblower dot org,
2 slash, doc, that's d-o-c, slash, capital R, slash,
3 capital R for Russian, okay, percent 20, nuclear with
4 capital N, percent 20, danger with a capital D, dot
5 PDF.

6 And the reason I am suggesting this is
7 because I was interviewed by that Mahia Miranova who
8 is one of Russia's most prominent environmentalists.
9 And she spoke to me about the Mayak plutonium facility
10 in Russia. And she's been responsible for having to
11 relocate people. And the contamination was half a
12 million people.

13 And the Mayak facility is still operating.
14 And it has totally ruined their river, the Tetra
15 River, not to mention the surrounding lakes. And the
16 nuclear contamination is starting to move towards the
17 arctic waters. And so I felt terribly sad for her.

18 And I was devastated by our meeting. And I
19 gave her a poem to give her hope to take back to her
20 country, because I am not here just for myself and my
21 own safety, but I want to see our whole world safe.

22 We have enough nuclear around our globe to
23 blow it up many, many, many times over. Nuclear does
24 not make me feel more safe. I gave her a poem and it
25 goes like this.

1 In dreams my wishing sees myself cupping my
2 hands and drinking purest water from the Rio Grande
3 just as my ancestors did. My hands are filled with
4 this dream within beautiful dreams. And I know that
5 when the world can drink like this from its rivers,
6 that we will all be safe and blessed by the earth.
7 This is the great bendicion. And this is in a nuclear
8 free world. I wish you generations, all of you, a
9 beautiful life.

10 MR. BROWN: Francine will be followed by
11 Garrett Robinson. Let me just add one comment here.
12 I apologize for having to constantly remind people of
13 having one minute remaining, but we have 60 speakers
14 left. So thanks for complying with the time
15 requirement. Francine, please.

16 MS. LINDBERG: The focus of my comments will
17 be cumulative impacts and national security. My name
18 is Francine Lindberg, I am the mother of four sons,
19 all products of the Taos municipal school system, and
20 my family has lived there for over 20 years.

21 I'm proud to say one son is currently
22 studying in Belgium, another in Germany, and the other
23 two have the ambition to study in Japan and Argentina,
24 respectively. My sons have friends with whom they
25 keep in regular contact who are from Taiwan, Korea,

1 Albania, Spain, Saudi Arabia, Denmark, Germany, and
2 Australia just to name a few.

3 I'm well aware of our changing world and the
4 interconnectedness of all beings and of all nations.
5 Among the various pieces of complex transformation is
6 a plan to build a larger plutonium complex at LANL.
7 It would allow the capacity to produce up to 80
8 plutonium bomb pits each year or more. A study by
9 Jason Defense Advisories Group has determined that
10 existing pits have a lifetime of 85 to 100 years, 85
11 to 100 years.

12 Why then is there a rush to build new ones.
13 The international community is well aware of nuclear
14 probability. And there was the atomic bomb in
15 Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the catastrophic results of
16 which are still visible today in the form of lasting
17 generational imprint of horror and destruction as
18 family legacy.

19 Why would our great nation want to lead the
20 race toward propagating potential for more such
21 barbarism. Our great nation cannot afford to be
22 isolationist. Isolationism is a concept that no
23 longer bears any validity in the concepts of today's
24 global reality. We should be leaders in disarmament
25 of all nuclear weapons for the sake of our children

1 who are the world's children and their children's
2 children.

3 As a citizen of the United States and a
4 resident of State of New Mexico, I say the world
5 doesn't need any nuclear weapons. So before a hasty
6 decision is made to build any new nuclear weapons, I
7 would like to see an in-depth analysis comparing,
8 quote, the strength of U.S. national security while
9 having a U.S. foreign policy based on a leadership
10 role in global nuclear disarmament as opposed to the
11 strengths of the U.S. national security while having a
12 U.S. foreign policy based on the creation of new
13 nuclear weapons, end quote, and otherwise known as
14 nuclear proliferation.

15 It's my understanding that the necessary
16 infrastructure to eliminate all nuclear weapons and
17 nuclear weapons grade material worldwide already
18 exists. I would like to see the viability of
19 enhancing national security through U.S. leadership in
20 global nuclear weapons abolition analyzed as an
21 alternative to complex transformation. Thank you.

22 MR. BROWN: Garrett Robinson is speaking
23 next. Eric Kuerschner will follow.

24 MR. ROBINSON: Good evening. I'm up here
25 speaking not in defense of pit production but

1 certainly respecting in its totality all of the
2 environmental and safety concerns about this endeavor
3 up in Los Alamos. I am, however, speaking as a father
4 and as a citizen of Santa Fe.

5 My children are fourth generation Santa
6 Feans. And anyone that has lived here for any length
7 of time certainly in the third, fourth, and fifth
8 generation category will tell you that we have been
9 enormously blessed by the money that has trickled down
10 to the City of Santa Fe, the County of Santa Fe, and
11 the Rio Grande Valley. Anybody that says that we
12 haven't is not living in reality.

13 The jobs and having a close proximity to such
14 a scientific community is immeasurable. However, if
15 we want to deal only strictly in reality, the City of
16 Santa Fe is in serious economic trouble. Serious.
17 Our roads are falling apart, the infrastructure is
18 falling apart, and anybody that thinks that this city
19 can maintain itself simply on selling of art or
20 tourism is seriously missing the point.

21 I have no affiliation whatsoever with Los
22 Alamos Labs and nobody in my family has ever been nor
23 have we ever received any remuneration. But having
24 grown up here and having felt the residual of the
25 money that has been generated from this laboratory and

1 our school systems and now a deteriorating road system
2 and building infrastructure and it goes on and on and
3 on.

4 I can tell you that we have to think long and
5 hard about not giving every benefit of the doubt to
6 this entity up in Los Alamos that's blessed us so
7 mightily. And again I think the environmental
8 concerns, the safety concerns, boy, I'm all for that;
9 every check and balances that need to be put in place,
10 I'm all for that as a father and a citizen.

11 But I'm also all in favor of maintaining this
12 laboratory and the work that's going to go on for
13 decades and will benefit my grandchildren and their
14 grandchildren. Thank you.

15 MR. BROWN: Eric Kuerschner. William
16 Christison will be next.

17 MR. KUERSCHNER: My name is Eric Kuerschner,
18 I've lived in Taos for the last 20 years. Prior to
19 that I worked as an economist working on my first EIS
20 in 1971. And I can just tell you, boy, they sure
21 don't do things like they did back then.

22 Back then we cared about doing something real
23 and doing something good and worked on the Mount Hood
24 freeway. The feds wanted one thing, they wanted a
25 freeway punched through there. And we, the citizens,

1 said no, that doesn't seem like a good idea. And they
2 said that's the way that we want you to do it.

3 And we started out and said what are the
4 laws, not what do you want us to do, what is the best
5 way to do it. And so we worked and showed what was
6 the best way to do it. Here we come up with nonsense,
7 we're told that they're not going to look at
8 alternatives to nuclear weapons.

9 We're not told what they produce. We do know
10 that half -- nuclear weapons have cost us half of what
11 all the military has, almost all of Social Security,
12 more than Medicare. I mean I've heard people say that
13 you're not living in reality, that LANL is an economic
14 engine.

15 I go, my God, have these people not taken
16 economics 101. I mean LANL is not an economic engine.
17 I mean these are people that are taken out of work
18 force. Those 12,000 people at LANL are 12,000 people
19 that the rest of us now have to work longer and harder
20 to support because they're not contributing to
21 anything, at least they're not telling us what they're
22 contributing to.

23 The same with the \$2 million. I mean what is
24 \$2 million? It's money coming in. It entitles you to
25 purchase goods and services. But if no additional

1 goods and services have been brought into the
2 community, what that means is now all those \$2 million
3 do is pick our pockets.

4 We have to give up \$2 billion worth of our
5 goods and services so we can support these people.
6 And I hear this thing of needs, needs, needs. I mean
7 to me that's like a drunk looking on the porch for his
8 keys because the light is good there. It has nothing
9 to do with anything.

10 I mean we've already answered the question
11 of -- if you look at the evidence, here it is. They
12 keep talking about reducing the stockpile. I mean
13 it's nonsense metrics. I mean what matters is all the
14 money is getting sucked out of here.

15 We were 38th at one time, now we're 46th. I
16 mean we're going into a recession not so much because
17 of the housing stop, because the military is sucking
18 everything out of our economy, leaving us with
19 nothing.

20 MR. BROWN: Colin Holloway will be next.

21 MR. CHRISTISON: My name is William
22 Christison. My qualifications, I'm retired now. And
23 I've been studying this issue very hard for the last X
24 number of years. Earlier than that I worked for the
25 Central Intelligence Agency for 28 and a half years.

1 And I actually wrote three of the very early national
2 intelligence estimates on nuclear proliferation.

3 I oppose most strongly any new nuclear
4 weapons in the United States. I want instead nuclear
5 disarmament as called for in the Nuclear
6 Nonproliferation Treaty. That treaty has been in
7 effect now for 38 years.

8 It came into effect in 1970. In that treaty
9 the U.S. promised to work seriously toward global
10 nuclear disarmament and global general disarmament.
11 But the U.S. has not taken one meaningful step toward
12 nuclear disarmament in the entire 38 years.
13 Thirty-eight years is over, one-third of a century,
14 people.

15 The point that needs to be made is that what
16 the people who have spoken to us officially tonight
17 have been proposing is they are going to cut and have
18 cut in the past the numbers of nuclear weapons. Now,
19 that is by no means nuclear disarmament.

20 One of the reasons you cut the number of
21 weapons is as you acquire more accurate delivery
22 systems, you need fewer weapons to destroy the same
23 number of targets. Instead of needing to devote eight
24 weapons to one target, you need maybe only one or
25 maybe two.

1 But more than that, 15 or 20 years ago this
2 nation had four or five times as many nuclear weapons
3 as it could possibly need or even use, even deliver in
4 any meaningful way. So that's just nonsense.

5 But as long as the U.S. has nukes, more
6 countries will want them. You can't get away from
7 that fact. In the Middle East, as long as Israel has
8 nukes and India and Pakistan also have them, others in
9 that area will want them too.

10 Over the longer term, in this situation which
11 represents a mammoth hypocrisy by the United States,
12 the only result will be more nuclear proliferation.
13 Thank you very much.

14 MR. BROWN: Jay Coghlin will follow Colin
15 Holloway.

16 MR. HOLLOWAY: Hi, there. My name is Colin
17 Lincoln Holloway. I live outside of -- in a tiny
18 village outside of the little village of Pecos, New
19 Mexico. I'm drug into the terrible economic engine of
20 Santa Fe on a fairly much daily basis.

21 I've been struck by this thing about bringing
22 this weapons complex into the 21st century. You see,
23 it's rather ironic for me because next week -- or
24 rather pardon me. A month from today I will be
25 attending the 30th anniversary reunion for the Rocky

1 Flats Truth Force.

2 I'll be hanging out with Daniel Elsborg and,
3 bless his soul, Alan Ginsberg is no longer with us,
4 and Evan Freirich and Jack Joppa and many of the great
5 people who stood up to the weapons facility at Rocky
6 Flats.

7 So, you know, in 30 years since I was 16,
8 I've changed my attitudes about a lot of things. I
9 used to be an, oh, militant vegetarian Luddite. Now,
10 I'm a rifle hunting chain saw wielding neo-Luddite.

11 The one thing that hasn't changed and it
12 doesn't seem to be spoken of very much is now they're
13 called pits. Back then we called them triggers, like
14 it was some crescent-shaped innocuous mechanical
15 things that just so happened to be made out of
16 plutonium.

17 These are the same weapons, these are the
18 same things, these are the same bombs that was the
19 third bomb that was built, developed, and detonated
20 over Nagasaki, Japan, in 1945. These are weapons of
21 mass destruction.

22 And, you know, so we're going to put them up
23 there, we're going to bring these weapons in and out
24 of this canyon. You know, that road up to Los Alamos,
25 everybody has gone there. Have you ever noticed that

1 they paint the barriers almost monthly. You know, all
2 those black streaks where people go flying off of that
3 road.

4 And then, you know, you can think about, you
5 know, in 1950 in Korea you had the battle of the River
6 of Chung Ang. You had the Battle of the Hundred Slain
7 where Crazy Horse brought Fetterman into a canyon and
8 wiped out his boys.

9 You've got what's happening now in
10 Afghanistan and Iraq, where you have the same thing;
11 although in Afghanistan they might be canyons like you
12 have in Los Alamos, in Baghdad they might be the
13 concrete canyons. It's still the same.

14 It is Tim, Eric, and Osama's greatest. I
15 mean why do we want to give them this opportunity. If
16 we're truly afraid of terrorism, why are we going to
17 run trucks with nuclear bombs down a gauntlet where
18 there are more hiding places than you can shake a
19 stick at. Thank you very much.

20 MR. BROWN: Jay Coghlin and Peggy Prince will
21 be next.

22 MR. COGHLIN: Howdy. I'm Jay Coghlin, I work
23 for Nuclear Watch New Mexico here in Santa Fe. Let's
24 see, first of all I want to start out praising Ted
25 Wyka here. I and others asked him to make sure that

1 all the reference docs -- you think those documents
2 are thick right there. You ought to see all the
3 reference docs.

4 But in any event we asked him to see to it
5 that they were posted online. If you're serious about
6 this stuff, the reference docs are crucial. And Ted
7 and his team saw to it that it was done. So, you
8 know, give credit where credit is due. NNSA did a
9 good thing here.

10 Now, let's see, last April I met with others,
11 with Ted's boss, Tom D'Agostino. He's head of the
12 National Nuclear Security Administration. D'Agostino,
13 you know, he's a pretty slick guy, I guess that's fair
14 to say.

15 So given this audience, he chose to lead that
16 meeting with how he was in full total and committed
17 support of the nonproliferation treaty's obligation to
18 disarm. Well, that's quite a line. This is coming
19 from the very head of the NNSA weapons program.

20 But from there he goes on to say there's only
21 one problem. And it's one of timing. Oh, boy.
22 That's the only problem, one of timing.

23 So again I reiterate that the head of these
24 weapons programs explicitly pledged his support for
25 disarmament. But from there he goes on to argue that

1 the key interim step to undertake to get there is to
2 create new nuclear weapons, that being the so-called
3 reliable replacement warheads.

4 Now, that strikes me -- how shall I put it --
5 as a little illogical. And don't be fooled by this
6 proposal to expand pit production at Los Alamos to 50
7 to 80 pits a year. It is all about new designs, the
8 so-called reliable replacement warheads. And, in
9 fact, Tom D'Agostino, the NNSA head, was giving
10 testimony to the House Armed Services on February 27
11 once again strongly pushing reliable replacement
12 warheads.

13 That's okay. I can only touch on things.
14 Ted knows I'll do this, I'll really drill into the
15 issues in written comments. That's where the real fun
16 begins. Nuclear Watch has three fact sheets back
17 there. I urge the audience to pick them up. We
18 explore this in pretty good depth. You can go to our
19 web site, nukewatch.org.

20 But I'll just close by repeating again the
21 5080 alternative for pit production is about new
22 designs. They don't need pit production other than
23 that. Their opening argument for pit production was
24 to replace W88 pits that they destructively analyzed.

25 Last year Los Alamos produced ten of them.

1 But the fact is they only tear down one pit per weapon
2 type per year. For the other types, the Pantex plant
3 is specifically authorized to reuse 350 pits a year.

4 And then finally another speaker alluded to
5 this. And Nuke Watch had something to do with this.
6 I'll conclude. But at Nuke Watch's request, Senator
7 Bingaman required that Jason report on pit lifetimes.

8 And that report found that pits last a
9 century or more. There is simply no need for expanded
10 pit production other than new designs. And I ask you
11 all to vigorously oppose that expanded pit production.
12 Thank you.

13 MR. BROWN: Peggy Prince. And Tom Gallegos
14 will be next.

15 MS. PRINCE: Hi, everybody. I'm Peggy
16 Prince, the director of Peace Action New Mexico. But
17 I'm not here tonight in that capacity. I'm here with
18 my organizer's hat on. And I want to show you
19 something that you've done. You have signed 2,250
20 signatures to this petition. And let me read you the
21 petition.

22 It says I vigorously oppose the proposal for
23 LANL to continue or expand its nuclear weapons
24 mission. It is dangerous to the health and safety of
25 the environment and all life in Northern New Mexico.

1 So that's the petition.

2 Now, I was going to turn these petitions over
3 to Ted Wyka tonight to be included in the comment
4 period in the final draft. But I'm not going to do
5 that yet, because we've got currently until April 10
6 which is the end of the formal comment period. And I
7 want you guys to vigorously sign onto this petition.
8 I want at least, let's be friendly about this, 10,000
9 more signatures.

10 This is just from Northern New Mexico, folks.
11 This is just from us. We can do better. Now, there
12 are a bunch of petitions at the Peace Action table at
13 the back. And also Shannyn Sollitt at her peace
14 project table over here will have the petitions as
15 well.

16 The address for returning them are on here,
17 the telephone number. Take a blank one, xerox it,
18 send it to your friends, put it out to your church
19 groups, your social groups, anybody you can think of,
20 colleges, schools, anyone can sign it, you don't have
21 to be a citizen. This affects not just us, this
22 affects the world. So please get on it. Okay. Thank
23 you.

24 Now, on a personal note, if I may, I would
25 like to dedicate this hearing to Soochie also known as

1 Seeley Solomon. She was the most dedicated,
2 tenacious, and eloquent speaker against nuclear
3 weapons programs we have ever had. And she never
4 missed a nuclear hearing.

5 And we miss her terribly. I miss her smiling
6 face and her little yoga poses. And so God bless her.
7 And I hope she's here tonight. Thank you very much.

8 MR. BROWN: Tom will be followed by Roger
9 Bernstein.

10 MR. GALLEGOS: Good evening. I'm Tom
11 Gallegos from Santa Fe. I'd like to make a comment
12 against any increase -- against the idea of having a
13 distributed center of excellence for increased
14 plutonium production and storage in Los Alamos.

15 I think we should not have any increased
16 plutonium production at all in part because Los Alamos
17 is in too close proximity to local population centers
18 to continue plutonium pit production and storage.

19 Contamination and pollution will increasingly
20 endanger and affect the nearby Indian pueblos, Santa
21 Clara, San Idelfonso, Cochiti, Nambe, Okay Owingeh,
22 Picarus, Taos, and, of course, Espanola and Santa Fe
23 and all the communities and possibly down into
24 Albuquerque.

25 These communities will increasingly rely on

1 storm water drainage, surface waters, and groundwaters
2 that flow from the Los Alamos area to the Rio Grande
3 River. In addition, there is potential for
4 contamination of pollution from seismic activity,
5 natural disaster, accidents, and security breaches or
6 other events that would do irreparable harm for the
7 environment and ecology of this area.

8 Instead I would rather see Los Alamos be made
9 as a distributive center for excellence for nuclear
10 decontamination and cleanup. This new focus would
11 contribute to the overall mission of this project here
12 and provide for much needed research and expertise on
13 methods to control and remediate nuclear waste.

14 These activities would have worldwide
15 relevance in helping other countries to more safely
16 handle and dispose of the complex contaminants and
17 pollutants involved in all aspects of nuclear
18 production. In addition, it would help create a new
19 research and development economy in the Los Alamos
20 area.

21 And this technology would also help LANL to
22 remediate the existing waste contaminants and
23 pollution that threaten North Central New Mexico. In
24 short we could actually clean up Los Alamos, something
25 that's been promised for 40 years but still has not

1 been done. Thank you very much I appreciate it.

2 MR. BROWN: Peter Nells will follow Roger.

3 MR. BERNSTEIN: You all can stay, I'm going
4 to be two minutes or less here. My name is Rob
5 Bernstein, I'm a physician in Santa Fe. I'm a
6 specialist in diabetes and endocrinology. I've been
7 in Santa Fe for 29 years, I have two grown daughters
8 that were born and raised here, are graduates of Santa
9 Fe public high school system and graduates of UNM.

10 I'm here on behalf of Physicians for Social
11 Responsibility which is a nationwide organization of
12 35,000 healthcare professionals. Physicians for
13 Social Responsibility was organized in 1961 by
14 physicians that were concerned about the health
15 consequences of nuclear weapons. We are still
16 concerned about the health consequences of nuclear
17 weapons.

18 Physicians for Social Responsibility wants to
19 point out several things as health professionals and
20 the health aspects. Since the Manhattan Project,
21 hundreds of thousands of workers have been exposed to
22 ionizing radiation. Finally in the year 2000, the
23 United States Government acknowledged that some of
24 these people had been harmed. And there is
25 compensation for some of these people.

1 Last summer the Rocky Mountain News based on
2 the government's own figures reported that at least
3 36,000 Americans have been made ill by ionizing
4 radiation and at least 4,000 have died. This is based
5 on the government's own records.

6 There are numerous public health consequences
7 of the manufacture and testing of nuclear weapons.
8 Physicians for Social Responsibility opposes the
9 complex transformation 2030. And we urge several
10 things.

11 Number one, there should be a complete human
12 health risk assessment of the proposed nuclear weapons
13 production activity. Secondly, we feel that the role,
14 the future role of nuclear deterrents should be
15 clearly articulated, what are we going to do with
16 these weapons.

17 Thirdly, we need the United States Department
18 of Energy to make public and disseminate the results
19 of epidemiologic studies on the effects of radiation
20 exposure. And in addition to all of this, we strongly
21 urge the United States Department of Energy to
22 completely abandon the effort to redevelop nuclear
23 weapons.

24 These weapons are costly, they're
25 destabilizing, they're unnecessary, and they're

1 unhealthy. What we need is cleanup of the previous
2 waste from nuclear weapons production. Thank you very
3 much.

4 MR. BROWN: After Peter Greg Mello is next.

5 MR. NELLS: My name is Peter Nells, I'm the
6 president of Los Alamos Study Group. In the last
7 week, several long-standing aspirations of the NNSA
8 have been repackaged and then peddled to the local
9 press to make it seem as if opponents to nuclear
10 weapons are attempting to misrepresent or otherwise
11 exaggerate the intentions of the NNSA.

12 This has led to a series of articles in the
13 local press that have only a tangential basis in fact.
14 Did you see the New Mexican Tuesday morning, any of
15 you? And unfortunately for the public they give more
16 measured points of view very short shrift.

17 The study group has recently learned from an
18 unimpeachable source that Los Alamos has retained the
19 services of Burson-Marsteller, the world's fifth
20 largest public relations firm. Perhaps this explains
21 the new messaging campaign rolled out for these
22 hearings. More incredibly, and think about this, we
23 have a national lab paying a PR firm to repackage
24 their program, paying them to mislead us with our
25 money. I submit that this redefines chutzpah.

1 Last year the agency failed to persuade
2 Congress that the RRW was not a new weapon. This made
3 sense. The notion that the RRW is not a new weapon
4 didn't pass the straight-face test. Now, the agency
5 is telling us there are no plans to build a new weapon
6 at Los Alamos. At the same time, it has reintroduced
7 the RRW in the '09 budget.

8 For the previous five budget cycles, the NNSA
9 has been telling Congress that the CMRR is essential
10 to meet pit production requirements. The new message
11 being communicated to the public is that the CMRR is
12 not for pit production.

13 Either the NNSA has been misleading Congress
14 for years or is misleading us now. The NNSA claims
15 they will not increase pit production from ten or so
16 pits that they now produce. The study group believes
17 there exists no directive to produce even one pit per
18 year. Nor many veteran weapons scientists agree is
19 pit production necessary to ensure the reliability of
20 the stockpile.

21 Congressman Udall wants to convert Los Alamos
22 to another mission. If he is serious about
23 conversion, why did he try to restore funding for a
24 new generation of nuclear weapons last year. This
25 both compromises broader nonproliferation efforts and

1 contradicts his stated objectives.

2 Abolishing nuclear weapons means stopping
3 production and dismantling the existing stockpile.
4 Some jobs will be lost. If we're not willing to have
5 tough conversations with elected officials who offer
6 us glib reassurances while doing the opposite when
7 they vote in Washington, we will never get beyond
8 nuclear weapons and the huge social and opportunity
9 costs they represent.

10 The current economic downturn is probably one
11 of the least understood, most underestimated in our
12 history and one over which we will have diminishing
13 control because it is caused in part by many factors
14 that are out of our control. Nuclear weapons do not
15 contribute to our national security, nuclear weapons
16 are a vice we can no longer afford. Thank you.

17 MR. BROWN: Greg will be followed by Diana
18 MacArthur.

19 MR. MELLO: Good evening. My name is Greg
20 Mello, I'm the director of the Los Alamos Study Group.
21 Recently the commander in chief of the U.S. Strategic
22 Command more or less summed up the purpose of this
23 proposal and this hearing this evening in a meeting
24 with reporters in Washington.

25 I'm quoting from the Army Times of March 7.

1 General Chilton said what we need is a modernized
2 nuclear weapon to go with our modernized delivery
3 platforms that we've worked on and we are working on
4 and a responsive infrastructure, one that can produce
5 weapons.

6 The core of the present proposal is about
7 producing weapons. The pivotal part of producing
8 weapons as Ted said is producing plutonium pits.
9 That's the capability that we lost in 1989. Thank
10 goodness.

11 The necessary facility, the central thing
12 that's needed to produce plutonium pits in quantity is
13 a lot of capital investment at LANL's Technical Area
14 55. The flagship of that investment is called the
15 Chemistry and Metallurgy Research Replacement
16 facility, CMRR.

17 It has a price tag of at least 2.2 billion.
18 It is closely connected to a series of other projects
19 including upgrading the existing plutonium facility.
20 The total price tag of all of these is over \$3
21 billion. The life cycle cost of this is in the tens
22 of billions of dollars.

23 This proposal to continue -- I should say the
24 CMRR consists of two buildings. So that you might
25 have gotten the mistaken impression that this is under

1 construction. That's only slightly true. The
2 smallest building of the two is under construction.

3 That building represents about 10 percent of
4 the project. The 90 percent of the project is hanging
5 fire. The NNSA is not sure how big to build that
6 building. And it has been attacked for five years
7 running in the House of Representatives.

8 I want to mention that a very senior NNSA
9 official with extensive lifetime experience in most of
10 the weapon sites in the weapons complex and extensive
11 experience at Los Alamos National Laboratory told me
12 not long ago that Los Alamos's plutonium facility is,
13 quote, a horror show, horror show, and that Los Alamos
14 should never have this pit production mission.

15 Let's see. We've heard about environmental
16 dangers which are real and increasing as speakers have
17 noted. In the classified appendix there are greater
18 dangers than are in the environmental field.

19 The classified appendix covers the effects of
20 intentional malicious acts. It's virtually impossible
21 to fully defend against intentional malicious acts in
22 the plutonium environment. Thank you.

23 MR. BROWN: Diane will be followed by Rebecca
24 Porter.

25 MS. MacARTHUR: First of all, be sure you can

1 hear me because I was sitting back there. It's
2 amazing how many people we couldn't hear at first.
3 Can you hear me? Okay. Thank you.

4 MR. BROWN: If folks can't hear, raise your
5 hand and we'll try and adjust the mike.

6 MS. MacARTHUR: My name is Diana MacArthur, a
7 native born New Mexican. My father was the first
8 student at Los Alamos Ranch School for boys. The
9 relatives of my sister who married a Native American
10 and my stepmother who hailed from the Vigil and Romero
11 families of Northern New Mexico have made lasting
12 careers at Los Alamos. We know the importance of Los
13 Alamos National Laboratory as a crucial economic force
14 in Northern New Mexico.

15 Today I speak as the president of the Board
16 of the Los Alamos National Laboratory Foundation. The
17 LANL Foundation acknowledges the generosity of the lab
18 contractors, the NNSA, and DOE, in providing millions
19 of dollars which we have given to improve the
20 education of our children in Northern New Mexico.

21 To date \$26 million has been given to school
22 districts in seven Northern New Mexico communities.
23 Counties actually. And the employees of the lab have
24 donated \$1.7 million for college scholarships. And as
25 I speak 50 more students are being interviewed and

1 selected for college scholarships for the coming year.

2 The focus of the money is to better prepare
3 students in science, technology, engineering, and
4 mathematics. We need to provide New Mexicans with the
5 education to participate in the high tech industries
6 that are the future of New Mexico at the national
7 labs, at IT companies such as Intel and smaller
8 start-ups, and in the emerging space, biotech, and
9 green industry, green energy industries.

10 NNSA's complex transformation plan for Los
11 Alamos will provide state-of-the-art facilities and
12 requirements for experimental sciences that will offer
13 training and employment for our students and I suppose
14 in pit production, but most importantly for the
15 associated scientific disciplines.

16 The science that comes with the preferred
17 alternative for Los Alamos will enable research into
18 global climate change, environmental remediation, and
19 development of novel materials that will support
20 solutions to alternative energy sources and energy
21 efficiency.

22 So what I want to say is that regardless of
23 what the plan will become for Los Alamos, the fact
24 that it can continue as an important R&D center, where
25 advanced computing and all of the sciences that have

1 enabled it to be one of the most preeminent research
2 facilities in the world, that somehow all will
3 continue for the education and for the future jobs and
4 for the future base of developing industries in this
5 state. Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: Sharron Potter will follow
7 Rebecca.

8 MS. PROCTER: It sounds like I need to
9 apologize for my handwriting. My name is Rebecca
10 Procter, I'm from Santa Fe County. You can hear me
11 okay in the back?

12 Strictly within the context of NEPA, I want
13 to say that the current summary of the Programmatic
14 Supplemental EIS, and that's this little document, not
15 the big one on the table, the summary does not
16 consider cumulative effects of the alternative
17 proposed, particularly the cumulative effects of
18 concentrating weapon building and testing at three
19 sites within a few hundred miles of each other in the
20 single state of New Mexico.

21 A consideration of cumulative effects is
22 required by law and must include such topics as
23 cumulative changes to drinking water from materials
24 used in weapons production or explosion testing,
25 whatever might take place in that venue, cumulative

1 statistical probabilities of accidents, and cumulative
2 health effects.

3 However, and more importantly, in a broader
4 context, I would like to draw the attention of my
5 fellow citizens to this fact. Although we are
6 ostensibly attending a NEPA mandated hearing, the
7 action that will be taken by NNSA on behalf of the
8 federal government has already been explicitly and
9 unequivocally stated on page 7 of the summary
10 document.

11 If you haven't seen it yet, go ahead and look
12 there. It is this, despite the overwhelming majority
13 of citizen comments rejecting the nuclear weapons
14 program entirely as immoral, contrary to treaty
15 requirements, and indefensible in a practical way for
16 sustaining the existence of the human race and other
17 living things, the document indicates that because,
18 quote, national security policy requires the existence
19 of nuclear weapons, there will be no consideration of
20 the alternative that calls for a disarmament and
21 disassembly of the weapons network.

22 Please note that this means the current
23 so-called NEPA input session is meaningless. Your
24 information and thoughts on disarmament are not wanted
25 and will not enter into the serious evaluation of the

1 operational alternatives being described here.

2 You can, however, do as I am doing now. That
3 is to declare your independence from a corporately
4 controlled plutocracy that masquerades as American
5 democracy and to state unequivocally that you, as I
6 am, will continue to call for disarmament in every
7 public venue available to you regardless of the
8 setting or regulatory framework. Thank you.

9 MR. BROWN: Our next speaker is D. Bonehead.
10 And they will be followed by Sasha Pyle. Is a D.
11 Bonehead here? And Sasha will follow.

12 MR. BONEHEAD: It's funny, I was just on my
13 way out. Okay. I am in need of mental health
14 treatment. Tonight I found out, you know, and it's
15 helpful to me to know that, I'm so glad that I came
16 here and could be advised of that need to be treated.

17 I believe the roads in Santa Fe are cracking
18 and the schools are deteriorating and the food supply
19 as far as quality is concerned seems to be steadily
20 going downward because of the misguided and
21 unreasonable policies in this nation's foreign policy
22 that sustain a nuclear weapons complex which is
23 clearly a crime against humanity.

24 And on behalf of the other five point however
25 many billion people who couldn't be here tonight at

1 the Chavez center, I would like to remind those with
2 an interest in nuclear weapons that we have created
3 rules and laws which say we're better than that.

4 So let's be better than that and let's be
5 better than that in the next few months coming up to
6 the next election too, because it is about change.
7 I've heard people say it's going to be a sea change.
8 Well, it will be a sea change if we make it a sea
9 change. All right.

10 And I would like to extend a word of thanks
11 and honor to Bill Christison tonight for his
12 dedication and his brilliance. Thank you.

13 MR. BROWN: Sasha Pyle. And Jeff Paisner
14 will follow.

15 MS. PYLE: I'm Sasha Pyle and I have lived
16 since 1980 in the Santa Fe center of excellence. And
17 I'm on the steering committee of Nuclear Watch Center
18 of Excellence. I've decided to just call everything
19 that I like a center of excellence. I think it's a
20 really good idea.

21 I have a wonderful quote that I want to start
22 with that is by Jonathan Shell. He is a tremendous
23 analyst of geopolitics and he has written some
24 wonderful books including The Unconquerable World.
25 And this is from an essay that he wrote about 9/11

1 called A Hole in the World.

2 There is no technical solution to the
3 vulnerability of modern populations to weapons of mass
4 destruction. There is no technical solution to the
5 vulnerability of modern populations to weapons of mass
6 destruction. I think that's an important idea to try
7 to get across to NNSA right about now.

8 The proposed complex transformation is
9 magical. It's magical because it is simultaneously
10 too little too late and too much too soon. That's a
11 pretty good trick. Why is it too much too soon?

12 Well, there's a couple of really key reasons.
13 One is that we will soon have a new nuclear posture
14 review as Congress has directed that the incoming
15 administration will have to draw one up, which
16 hopefully will replace the 2001 nuclear posture review
17 which was an unholy mating of the ugliest weaponry in
18 the world with the foul idea of preemptive war.

19 In addition to the need for a new NPR, that
20 posture review will be informed by the findings of the
21 12-person bilateral commission that Congress is
22 creating which will have to create its report before
23 December 1st of this year. And that is the Strategic
24 Posture of the United States report, the Congressional
25 Commission on the Strategic Posture of the United

1 States.

2 And they're going to have a lot to say about
3 our nuclear posture. And what their recommendations
4 are is going to greatly shape the new nuclear posture
5 review. So we need to totally table this complex
6 transformation until we have more input from Congress
7 and a new administration and the public rather than
8 just allowing DOE to continue to try to reshape its
9 own image without any input from the rest of us.

10 So why is it too little too late? Because
11 the complex has needed to be transformed for decades.
12 But this really is not a transformation. What it does
13 is it transforms billions of dollars into weapons that
14 we don't need and waste that we have no place to put.

15 And that is not news and that is not a
16 transformation. And the CMRR -- I have this
17 ridiculous puff piece in my hand that says that
18 they're on schedule and on budget. This building was
19 supposed to cost \$650 million and now it's on the
20 order of \$2 billion because they just get to triple
21 their budget, they get to rebaseline any time they
22 want to.

23 This is not reduction, this is not a
24 consolidated complex. What I want to see is a real
25 transformation which would take the form of real

1 national security, nonproliferation work that is
2 substantive, dismantlement, curatorship, tracking down
3 special nuclear materials and corralling them and
4 getting them away from the hands of terrorists.

5 Real science which would be working on
6 infrastructure, transportation, energy, and real
7 cleanup, because the DOE has made a mess from sea to
8 shining sea and they are not addressing it. And
9 that's the transformation that we need to see. Thank
10 you.

11 MR. BROWN: Jeff will be followed by Jay
12 Perea.

13 MR. PAISNER: Okay. Good evening. My name
14 is Jeffrey Paisner. As a resident of Santa Fe, I
15 speak in support of the complex transformation
16 proposal and the preferred alternative. In the spirit
17 of transparency, I am also a physicist at Los Alamos
18 National Laboratory. In fact, I am one of the almost
19 2,000 Ph.D. scientists and engineers who work there.

20 Indeed, these individuals have been educated
21 in some of the best universities in the country. They
22 come from almost every state in the union. They have
23 come to Northern New Mexico and Los Alamos to help
24 solve some of the most difficult technical problems
25 facing our society.

1 Indeed, some of the solutions of these
2 technical problems will require -- in fact, may be
3 only completely solved at Los Alamos. Not solved. At
4 least the solutions will be spawned at Los Alamos.
5 Consequently I believe that individually and as a
6 scientific community we bring a perspective that
7 should be appreciated and respected by our neighbors.

8 Like my colleagues I have committed my
9 scientific career to working in national security
10 areas. This dedication is reflective of the
11 population, let me say the entire population of
12 laboratory scientists and engineers whose views are
13 freely communicated and I believe are representative
14 of the country at large.

15 In fact, this is a fundamental reason I
16 believe that President Truman and the Congress so
17 wisely established civilian control of the complex in
18 the manner they did nearly 60 years ago. As a
19 testament to that decision, the complex oftentimes led
20 by Los Alamos has been able to respond quickly and
21 proactively to and sometimes even anticipate world
22 changing events protecting our national interests.

23 I have spent almost half of my 34 years at
24 Los Alamos and Livermore in how to best to respond --
25 how to best responsibly ensure our nation's nuclear

1 deterrent. This same dedication to serving the nation
2 was integral for the analyses performed by NNSA in
3 articulating all reasonable alternatives and
4 developing the preferred alternative.

5 It is a tribute to the NNSA's effort that the
6 responsible stockpile stewards across this country who
7 like the rest of the public want to ensure a more
8 benevolent future for their families, friends, cities,
9 states, and countries who are involved in developing
10 and refining this proposal. Thank you.

11 MR. PEREA: I'm Jake Perea. I'm an engineer
12 at Los Alamos National Laboratory, but I'm here
13 tonight as a private citizen. I have been in Los
14 Alamos for 30 years. And I've been living in Santa Fe
15 for over 30 years.

16 My family has been in New Mexico for many,
17 many generations. And I'm, of course, a native New
18 Mexican. My children have grown up here in Santa Fe.
19 And I'm really pleased to see that I've got
20 grandchildren growing up here and that they're well
21 and healthy. The reason I mention that is because I
22 do care about my family, my friends, my community, my
23 state, and my country.

24 That said I support the department's
25 preferred alternative and I would like to see it put

1 into the record of decision. The reason I support it
2 is from a pragmatic standpoint. I don't believe
3 nuclear weapons are going to go away anytime soon.
4 And I believe that our best bet to reducing the size
5 of the stockpile is through deterrence by capability.

6 And I further think that the investment that
7 this alternative calls for will enable us to make our
8 weapons and the SNM that goes with them practically
9 more safe, more secure, and less environmental impact
10 than what we have today if we go other alternatives.
11 So that's the reason I support this preferred
12 alternative. Thank you.

13 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Our next speaker is
14 Shannyn Sollitt.

15 MS. SOLLITT: Hello, everybody. It's really
16 so good to see such a beautiful, beautiful turnout for
17 this. It seems like an event to me in some way
18 because it's just so tedious to think that we're going
19 to another hearing about the nuclear weapons complex.
20 Oh, my God. So anyway here we are.

21 And as most of you know or some of you know
22 or many of you know, I'm the person who conceived of
23 an idea called the Los Alamos Peace Project. And
24 indeed this peace project is for transformation of the
25 laboratory.

1 Just like NNSA wants, they just haven't put
2 it into the rules yet. This peace project is to
3 transform the laboratories of weapons of mass
4 destruction into an institution that is engaged only
5 in life affirming research and development.

6 So it's not an organization, I call it kind
7 of a -- it's a disorganization. And being that, then
8 everybody in this room who is standing for the
9 transformation of the laboratory to life affirming,
10 life affirming, life affirming research and
11 development is part of the Los Alamos Peace Project.

12 So everybody, welcome. And thank you. And
13 when I started this idea many years ago, about ten
14 years ago, people would say to me, oh, you'll never do
15 that, how do you think you're going to -- they'll
16 never do that, you know. And I was like, well, of
17 course, I'm not going to do it, we're going to do it,
18 we're all going to do it, we all have to do it.

19 And it's not they and us, where we get this
20 like schism between, you know, this country and this
21 country, we're all the people of this country. It's
22 not they, the National Nuclear Security
23 Administration, the Department of Energy, LANL, we're
24 all one.

25 And so I propose that we need to figure out

1 ways to heal this schism. And the first thing we need
2 to do is everybody here needs to write their
3 legislators, really write them a handwritten letter
4 saying what we want to see, because, you know, we're
5 separated from our legislators. And it's not the NNSA
6 that's going to decide, it's really the legislators.

7 There's cards over there for the Los Alamos
8 Peace Project. There's petitions. And mostly what we
9 have happening right now is there is a democracy
10 school starting here in Santa Fe. And it's had
11 several different incarnations. It's just beginning
12 now to work on the Tecton issue.

13 But it's a school where we can all learn that
14 actually this is our land, this is our water, this is
15 our air, this is our country, this is our
16 municipality. It doesn't belong to them.

17 So if anybody is interested in learning more
18 about the democracy school and the way work is being
19 done here in Santa Fe, New Mexico, and all over the
20 United States of the citizens reclaiming their right
21 to live in their country and have good clean air to
22 breathe and water to drink, then there's a signup
23 sheet where you can put your email and we'll connect
24 with you about the future democracy schools that are
25 coming here to Santa Fe.

1 And I believe we can turn this thing around,
2 we can turn it around, let's turn this thing around.
3 Thank you.

4 MR. BROWN: Anna Hansen. And Anna will be
5 followed by Sally Calvin.

6 MS. HANSEN: Thank you, Shannyn. Anything is
7 possible is my basic view of life. So my name is Anna
8 Hansen, I'm the former chair of Concerned Citizens For
9 Nuclear Safety from 2000 to 2001. I helped host the
10 Cerro Grande fire and the aftermath. The aftermath
11 produced more runoff off of Los Alamos in 2002 than
12 any year since the lab had been in business. The lab
13 is in business.

14 I am deeply, deeply concerned about the
15 quality of our water and that we have to clean up Los
16 Alamos. Los Alamos is the mission -- that is the
17 mission, that is the transformation mission, to turn
18 Los Alamos around and clean it up completely so that
19 there is no runoff, there is no contaminants coming
20 down the mountain.

21 One of the most amazing things to me at the
22 conference was scientists talking about naturally
23 occurring plutonium. Now, that is an oxymoron.
24 Naturally occurring plutonium does not exist.
25 Plutonium did not exist before 60 or 70 years ago. So

1 it is not naturally occurring. So that is another
2 falsehood that we are given.

3 I find it really amazing that we want to
4 continue to build new pit production which I am
5 strongly and deeply opposed to on top of an aquifer
6 that we already know is contaminated. Plutonium
7 exists in the Rio Grande. Anybody who doesn't know
8 that, you need to know that. Plutonium exists in the
9 Rio Grande today. Not yesterday, not tomorrow.

10 So you must be aware of that. It is in your
11 drinking water already. We have contaminants. It has
12 to stop, the mission has to change. We have to have a
13 transformation mission in Los Alamos. And that is
14 cleanup and that is, you know, energy, working on
15 climate change.

16 There are so many positive things, life
17 affirming aspects that Los Alamos can work on to help
18 our economy grow. But what I hear here is oh, we're
19 going to lose our money. It is our tax dollars that
20 is paying for Los Alamos. And we are the ones that
21 need to turn that mission around and we need to
22 continue to continue our positive energy of this
23 beautiful land of enchantment. Thank you very much.

24 MR. BROWN: Sally Calvin. Sally will be
25 followed by Penelope McMullen. Is Sally here?

1 Penelope McMullen. And Penelope will be followed by
2 Susan Gordon.

3 MS. McMULLEN: As you heard I'm Penelope
4 McMullen, I'm a Sister of Loretto. And I am speaking
5 in name of all the 600 sisters and co-members of the
6 Loretto community throughout the United States.

7 The Vatican has stated several years ago that
8 nuclear weapons are incompatible with the peace we
9 seek in the 21st century. Other religions have said
10 similar -- made similar statements. And they're not
11 talking just about using the nuclear weapons but also
12 producing them because of its effects on health and
13 the environment.

14 Based on my 24 years of experience studying
15 and working in this area -- I'm going to say a lot
16 more in my written comments. But tonight I'm only
17 going to address the issue that this PEIS is putting
18 the cart before the horse.

19 Now, Sasha Pyle talked about that and she's
20 much more eloquent than I am. But I think it's
21 important that NNSA hear it over and over again.

22 The House Armed Services Committee
23 specifically stated that, quote, there is an urgent
24 need for a debate over the role of nuclear weapons in
25 U.S. strategic posture. Congress has specifically

1 required the incoming President to prepare a new
2 nuclear posture review saying it, quote, should be
3 used as a basis for establishing future United States
4 arms control objectives and negotiating positions.

5 The same law also requires a bipartisan
6 commission to recommend by this December the number of
7 weapons really needed and the related appropriate size
8 and composition of the nuclear weapons complex. It
9 makes no sense for complex transformation to proceed
10 before a new nuclear posture review is prepared.

11 So NNSA's transformation PEIS should be
12 withdrawn until the new administration has issued its
13 own nuclear posture review which will undoubtedly
14 change aspects of the complex transformation as it is
15 currently written.

16 It will be a huge expensive misuse of
17 taxpayer money to begin to act on this complex
18 transformation and then have the next administration
19 decide to change it. I would like to ask for a show
20 of hands of how many people agree, because not
21 everybody here will be speaking.

22 And I would like the count to be put into the
23 record. Is that possible? So a show of hands of how
24 many people agree. And if somebody -- you couldn't
25 hear me? Through that whole talk you couldn't hear

1 me? So somebody up front count. Would you count,
2 Linda. Oh. That this PEIS should be withdrawn.
3 Okay.

4 Now, Margaret, is that your name? Can you
5 count please? And somebody on this side count.
6 Sixty-seven and 34. Thank you. Could you not hear me
7 back there through that whole thing?

8 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry. You're over time now.
9 Susan will be followed by Ed Burckle. Again if folks
10 can't hear in back, please let us know early on and we
11 can adjust the mike a bit. Susan.

12 MS. GORDON: My name is Susan Gordon and I'm
13 the director of the Alliance for Nuclear
14 Accountability which is a 20-year national
15 organization that has been representing the
16 communities that live downwind and downstream from the
17 Department of Energy's nuclear weapons complex sites.

18 I'm here to speak about what is missing from
19 the SPEIS. And the issue is that there were 33,000
20 comments that were originally delivered in the scoping
21 process. And it's talked about in the summary
22 document that was mentioned earlier.

23 Most of those comments address the issue of
24 the failure of the United States to honor its
25 obligations of the nonproliferation treaty. And most

1 of them requested that NNSA actually assess an
2 additional alternative which was disarmament. And
3 because the draft SPEIS does not present such an
4 alternative, this deficiency must be rectified in the
5 final SPEIS and it should include a fifth alternative,
6 a no-production alternative.

7 Under the no-production alternative, the NNSA
8 would continue to operate only those facilities
9 required to achieve the safe, secure, efficient
10 disassembly and dismantlement of nuclear weapons, and
11 the disposition and disposal are of their constituent
12 parts.

13 The benefits of the no-production alternative
14 include -- the no-production alternative will lead the
15 way to addressing the horrendous environmental legacy
16 of nuclear weapons production by closing the complex,
17 our tax dollars can be redirected to clean up and
18 remediate the impacts to the health and environment of
19 the communities downwind and downstream from the
20 nuclear weapons complex sites.

21 The no-production alternative will enhance
22 the economic status of the communities in which
23 facilities are located. Directing the efforts of the
24 work force towards dismantlement of warheads and
25 cleaning up the weapons production sites will create

1 jobs and improve the environmental quality of those
2 communities.

3 When sites are cleaned, they become available
4 for other economic development opportunities. The
5 no-production alternative is the only alternative that
6 fulfills the United States' obligations for
7 disarmament under the Article VI of the
8 nonproliferation treaty.

9 Further, it is the only alternative in which
10 the United States complies with the 1996 World Court
11 opinion that the threat or use of nuclear weapons is
12 contrary to the rules of international law. The
13 no-production provides the United States leadership
14 called for by arms control, diplomatic, and military
15 leaders around the world.

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

20 I also suggest that if you haven't had the
21 opportunity to see The Wall Street Journal editorial
22 by George Schultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and
23 Sam Nunn in January of 2007 and they did a second in
24 2008, I recommend it. They are calling for a world
25 without nuclear weapons.

1 The accelerating spread of nuclear weapons,
2 nuclear know-how, and nuclear material has brought us
3 to a nuclear tipping point. We face the very real
4 possibility that the deadliest weapons ever invented
5 could fall into dangerous hands.

6 The steps we are taking now to address these
7 threats are not adequate to the danger. With nuclear
8 weapons more widely available, deterrence is
9 decreasingly effective and increasingly hazardous.
10 And I think that that is the message that the
11 Department of Energy needs to realize and respond to.
12 Thank you.

13 MR. BROWN: Thank you. We are going to be
14 taking a brief break at about eight o'clock so we'll
15 have a couple more speakers before then. Nine
16 o'clock, I'm still in Central time. Sorry about that.
17 Nine o'clock. Time flies when you're having fun. So
18 we'll have a couple more speakers and then we'll take
19 a break. Or as I like to say, fun flies when you're
20 doing time.

21 MR. BURCKLE: My name is Ed Burckle I'm the
22 director of the Regional Development Corporation in
23 Santa Fe. We're a private nonprofit economic
24 development organization. We've been in existence
25 since 1996.

1 We were actually created by the Department of
2 Energy in '96 as a CRO to help put money back in the
3 Northern New Mexico because of the cutbacks that
4 occurred to the laboratory in the late 90s. And from
5 1998 to 2004, we got about \$10 million of DOE
6 appropriated funds to help communities in Northern New
7 Mexico weather through the downturn in the economic
8 condition created by laboratory layoffs.

9 That was in 2004. And those DOE monies dried
10 up. Today we receive zero monies from the Department
11 of Energy, yet our organization is intent on improving
12 the economics of Northern New Mexico.

13 And what I want to say is since the new
14 laboratory management came on board in June 2006, they
15 made a concerted commitment to help diversify the
16 economy of Northern New Mexico and to ensure that the
17 laboratory is less reliant upon lab employment for the
18 region's future economy.

19 And what I would like to talk about tonight
20 is what I have seen in my couple of years on the job.
21 And that is the commitment of LANSCE to provide a
22 million dollars a year out of fee, not out of
23 appropriated funds, to help with economic planning
24 around diversified projects.

25 And the laboratory is investing heavily now

1 in technology transfer, trying to speed the
2 commercialization of important science from the lab
3 into the local area. You probably saw yesterday's
4 Albuquerque Journal article that New Mexico is now the
5 number one venture capital receiving state in the
6 United States based upon growth in the last five
7 years. And that's because capital follows good ideas.

8 And what we're seeing now is the lab has made
9 a concerted effort to help fund solar energy projects,
10 medical research. In fact, they are working closely
11 with Northern New Mexico College on its solar energy
12 research park and academy.

13 They're helping Santa Fe Community College on
14 their advanced technology center about green and
15 establish sustainable energy. And so from my position
16 in economic development, I am seeing some great
17 initiatives coming out of the laboratory again
18 diversifying the economy, they want to be less
19 reliant.

20 And, in fact, they've established something
21 called the Venture Acceleration Fund. And they have
22 already funded six companies at \$600,000 to help speed
23 the commercialization of a lot of these products.

24 And, in fact, just a month ago we started
25 collaborating with LANL's Institute for Geophysics and

1 Planetary Physics which is going to analyze and model
2 the impact of climate change and the economy on
3 Northern New Mexico. These are the kind of efforts
4 that I'm proud to see the lab helping the local
5 communities. And I want to applaud the laboratory for
6 their recent efforts. Thank you.

7 MR. BROWN: Our next speaker is Manuel
8 Pacheco. Manuelo Pacheco, are you here? After then
9 we'll take a break. Let me call Priscilla Logan then
10 and then we'll take a break. Is Priscilla here?
11 Okay. So Priscilla is going to talk now.

12 MS. LOGAN: Good evening. My name is
13 Priscilla Logan. I am a retired teacher from Santa
14 Fe. I see some familiar faces here and that makes me
15 feel really good. I love this place, I love the land,
16 I love my students. And I'm afraid we're really being
17 hurt.

18 As someone brought up, we're not getting the
19 real truth. The real truth is sort of obscured in
20 misleading terms, hypocritical terms, you know, the
21 Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the
22 transformation, the reduction.

23 If people don't really listen and try to find
24 the truth, it's very hard to see. And that frightens
25 me. I'm glad that you're here and you're hearing this

1 and you're seeing this. But what about the other
2 people that don't know what the real transformation is
3 about, that reduction is really increasing from 20 to
4 200 pits possibly.

5 What do we do? We continue to say what we
6 feel and what we think to anyone that will listen.
7 Timing. I find it very interesting that this whole
8 thing is coming up right now before the election year.

9 Obviously our new President will be
10 interested in finding out and helping develop or
11 undevelop our nuclear arsenal. Is this just a
12 last-ditch chance to push in what DOE wants to
13 escalate and what most of the United States does not
14 want? That sort of feels like the timing issue that I
15 feel is happening.

16 I'm very concerned for our planet. I'm an
17 environmentalist and that's not bad. I care for the
18 earth. We have a lot of problems right now. We're
19 soiling our nest. Not just with radioactivity, with
20 so many, many other things. And we need to make so
21 many changes. Changes that aren't going to be easy.

22 But it's better for us to start making those
23 changes now voluntarily before we're having to make
24 them out of a crisis. We could go into crisis so very
25 easily if we continue to build nuclear weapons. How

1 many times do we have to be able to blow up our world
2 and create the midnight sun; and when that midnight
3 sun happens, there's no more earth, there's no more
4 seeing through the cloud cover.

5 We need to take care of you, our children,
6 and our land. And we need to do this by opposing this
7 entire issue. Thank you.

8 MR. BROWN: We will take a five-minute break.
9 On our return Louisa Quintana and Astrid Webster will
10 be our speakers. Thanks.

11 (Recess.)

12 MR. BROWN: If you'll take your seats, we'll
13 get started again. This has been a very large
14 turnout. And in addition, a large number of those in
15 attendance have signed up to speak. So I guess one of
16 the few advantages of having a number of speakers is
17 that those who have signed up have a good deal of time
18 to think about their remarks.

19 We are going to have to very strictly adhere
20 to the three-minute limit. So again if you can
21 summarize your key points and try and stay within the
22 three-minute limit, I would appreciate it.

23 (Loudspeaker interruption.)

24 MR. BROWN: Again if you can confine your
25 remarks to three minutes. I've also had some comments

1 that I'm a bit like that ad on TV. You know, it goes
2 on the head or something and people say I can't stand
3 your ad. I'm sorry about that. We're going to try a
4 couple things.

5 One is instead of trying a whole phrase, what
6 I may just do is just say one. So if you can listen
7 to that and when you get that, please try and conclude
8 in one minute. If people still find that irritating,
9 someone can hold up a sign, a one minute sign.

10 So we'll try that for awhile. And if people
11 tire of that, we'll go to the sign. So by way of
12 introduction, let me start with Priscilla Logan. Is
13 that right? There we are, right. Louisa Quintana is
14 next. And Astrid Webster will follow her.

15 MS. QUINTANA: Good evening, ladies and
16 gentlemen. My name is Louisa Quintana. I am an
17 eighth generation here in New Mexico. I live in a
18 village east of Santa Fe in the San Miguel Valley.

19 And I am here tonight -- I had no intention
20 of coming up and talking on this podium. But I have
21 some issues. To me this right here is merely a face.
22 I really don't believe that we know the true facts of
23 what really is going on.

24 And the reason I'm feeling this way is
25 because we have issues in our little village of 11

1 people. And I want to ask you, LANL, are you part of
2 the state engineer, part of that corporation metering
3 the little villages because the contamination is
4 coming into the pipelines or that's what they're
5 telling us or merely to save water?

6 I'm not real sure about that. But my
7 question is it looks like there's a bigger plan here
8 than we're more aware of. Just recently an alliance
9 was formed in the San Miguel Valley area. And the
10 people in the valley were not aware of it, only the
11 alliance who the state engineer formed and the board
12 members who they have brought in to form the board.

13 The villagers themselves are not aware of
14 this. And the reason I know that is because I've gone
15 from village to village asking the common man if they
16 know that they are being metered. Most of the answers
17 are no, we don't know that we're being metered, our
18 board members take care of that.

19 And I'm asking this question. Is it part of
20 the plan trying to preserve water or because we are
21 contaminated? I know that the entire state of New
22 Mexico is suffering from contamination. I live right
23 off of the Pecos River. And I'm sure there are issues
24 with the Rio Grande and the Gallina and the Pecos.

25 My question is those of you that are

1 representing LANL, you came in giving us some very
2 positive answers and just giving us a good
3 presentation. But I am very much opposed to the
4 nuclear project that you have.

5 And I also have a comment before leaving
6 here. Those of you that came up to the podium that
7 are representing LANL, you made comments that you're
8 giving monies for this and for education and so and
9 so. Why are you doing this?

10 These people that you're educating, how much
11 longer are they going to be with us when you're
12 contaminating this earth, how much longer, will they
13 live to be 14, will they live to be 20, will they live
14 to be 30. You're putting out the monies to educate
15 and educate. Let's put out the money to do the
16 cleanup. Thank you very much.

17 MR. BROWN: Astrid.

18 MS. WEBSTER: My name is Astrid Webster. And
19 it was my suggestion that a sign be held up that
20 people have one minute left, because I find it
21 extremely disruptive. The people who weren't very
22 bothered by it were LANL employees who had premade
23 speeches. Excuse me.

24 I listened to over 20 of those last night
25 including from an atomic blondie who loves to put her

1 hands in the glove boxes and fondle the plutonium. My
2 God. I've heard from a gentleman now three times who
3 feels he cleaned up Rocky Flats.

4 I would like to challenge them, if that's
5 true, to remove those three feet of dirt that they
6 covered that horribly toxic place with and grow their
7 vegetables there for the cafeteria at LANL. And then
8 come back in 20 years and tell me there's no pollution
9 there.

10 I just had a grand nephew born here in Santa
11 Fe. And that baby has one ear. Now, if you want to
12 know about that, there's a movie called Dark Circle.
13 And a farmer tells you about what happens to chickens
14 and everything else that are growing in Colorado or
15 not growing, who can't peck their way out of an egg.

16 Well, you know what. We can't peck our way
17 out of this egg either. They're supposed to be
18 listening to us and this is a foregone conclusion. I
19 listened to hundreds of people in 2006 say there
20 should be an alternative that is a no-build. Do you
21 see that anywhere?

22 Well, there's a chart back there that doesn't
23 say they're going to build plutonium pits at Los
24 Alamos, but they built ten last year. And the
25 environmental groups are the nuke groups that are

1 saying we want no expansion. Excuse me.

2 That's 20 over the legal limit. And we've
3 got to stop it because our kids' ears depend on it,
4 their hearts depend on it, and our future depends on
5 it. This world started in a big bang and Los Alamos
6 wants to see it end in a big bang. And we have to say
7 no.

8 We have to say no to Tom Udall who, when I
9 asked him if he wanted to sign a call for nuclear
10 disarmament, said no. And Jill stepped up and said I
11 will. So let's put her in the Senate.

12 And Jeff Bingaman is the other one who is
13 supposed to be such an environmentalist. Good God.
14 This Department of Energy is really the former Atomic
15 Energy Commission. And that is their only mission.

16 And if you were in Los Alamos last night, you
17 know they're committed to this heart and soul and they
18 will not stop. Now, the NMED is not allowed to look
19 at radionuclides when it says clean up Los Alamos.
20 What does that mean? If it's going to kill you really
21 fast or over 100 years, whichever comes first, they
22 can't discuss it.

23 If Robert McNamara isn't allowed to ask much
24 about nuclear weapons, how the hell can we know. And
25 why are we allowing a don't ask and don't tell policy,

1 we're not allowed to ask and they're not allowed to
2 tell us. And you know what? It's in your hands.
3 Today the election is coming and you've got to stop
4 these people from doing this. Thank you very much.

5 MR. BROWN: Steve Dulfer. Is Steve Dulfer
6 here? He left. Okay. Lorena Shalev. Okay. And
7 Anhara Lovato will be next.

8 MS. SHALEV: I have smeared ketchup on my
9 dress to symbolize the bloodshed in the name of the
10 U.S. national security doctrine which is a euphemism
11 for world domination. We have more WMDs than any
12 other nation's state on this earth. We are reneging
13 on our treaty obligations.

14 Nuclear bombs wreak devastation far beyond
15 what any man, woman, or child can imagine in their
16 worst nightmares. These weapons are immoral and
17 unethical. Who in their right minds would engage in
18 research that can lead to destruction far worse than
19 perpetrated on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Is this
20 intelligence?

21 The next issue is the proximity of this
22 facility, LANL, to major population and cultural
23 centers. No amount of plutonium leaking into our land
24 and water is safe. The Buchman diversion project
25 contemplated for Santa Fe water replenishment would

1 depend on wells that are already contaminated.

2 Money and work is urgently needed for
3 cleanup. There is phenomenal evidence that the
4 results from the monitoring wells may have been
5 distorted by certain factors like corrosion of the
6 screens which interferes with heavy metal testing.

7 And also we need to challenge the assumption
8 that tritium must be present for radionuclide
9 measurements to be valid because tritium is much more
10 mobile than the other radioactive elements and
11 isotopes.

12 Medical and epidemiological analysis from
13 those who mine uranium in Navajo country in years past
14 has demonstrated a statistically significant
15 correlation with at least lung cancer. Other
16 pathological conditions are also associated with
17 radioactive exposure.

18 I know it's anecdotal, but I have a personal
19 friend who died from brain cancer and he used to be a
20 uranium miner. All such mining is unsafe. No more
21 mining of uranium should ever be permitted. It is
22 correct that the Navajo Nation has outlawed such
23 actions on its territory.

24 There is enough uranium in either enriched or
25 depleted form to be used for more weapons than ever

1 should be produced. The nuclear bombs already created
2 can destroy all living beings on this earth. Is it
3 intelligent to create upgraded bombs?

4 The bombs the U.S. has already made and
5 stored are more than adequate as an effective
6 deterrent. Reputable scientists consider these bombs
7 reliable and viable for the next 100 years. I
8 postulate that no scientist or worker in this field is
9 intelligent at all. There is no justification for the
10 production of even one more pit.

11 MS. LOVATO: I have so much here, I'm going
12 to talk really, really fast. I just wanted to tell
13 you, my name is Anhara Lovato and I'm studying to be a
14 counselor. And amount of autism is one in five.

15 The heavy metals are going into -- are
16 passing the blood brain barrier. Radiation that is
17 used for pit production is a kind of tritium or
18 something that sinks right into your skin. Plutonium
19 you have to breathe it in.

20 If you breathe it in, one particle emits
21 radiation and knocks little pieces off your genetics.
22 That's what the whole thing is about. If you're
23 standing on a piece of radiation, it's beaming out
24 four feet; or if you're going by a plutonium truck,
25 you know, full of radiation, it's X-raying you and

1 knocking -- if I have a piece of radiation, it's
2 coming out of me.

3 But the point is that these things last, you
4 know, 280,000 years. You know, anyway the whole thing
5 is I'm trying to -- what I would like to tell you is
6 that I'm a Baha'i and that I hold Baha'i up as a model
7 for the world of consultation and neutrality and that
8 this is the time for, you know, justice and equality.

9 And I think there's a confusion that a lot of
10 Christians or people think that this is the end of the
11 world, but it's really the last of the cycle from Adam
12 to Muhammad and it really started with the Bab and
13 Baha'u'llah.

14 But there's one thing that will make us able
15 to have peace. And that is that we realize we're all
16 interconnected and that we're one planet. And that we
17 have to rely on I believe Baha'u'llah and God to
18 design our creation and not on Los Alamos Lab; and
19 that if we follow the nonproliferation treaty -- the
20 Baha'is have really tried hard.

21 And I recommend that the Los Alamos Lab has
22 to communicate with every single nation to review
23 everything with the United Nations and with every
24 single hearing that's ever been held and with all the
25 health records that have ever been written; and with

1 all the stories from Los Alamos, that they consult
2 with every tribe and every area of New Mexico, that
3 they consult with every single environmental group
4 like CCNS and Nuclear Watch, that they learn to
5 consult.

6 There is only one thing that's going to save
7 our planet and that is consultation. And we have to
8 consult with the United Nations explicitly of why the
9 nuclear proliferation act was created because if one
10 nation produces nuclear weapons, if we simultaneously
11 raised -- lowered our arms, then that will raise
12 suspicion among the other nations and, therefore, they
13 will start to create a new Cold War of every more --
14 and that horrible technology that can destroy with
15 hideous, more destructive power.

16 I want an environmental impact statement for
17 the entire nuclear industry of New Mexico, from the
18 uranium pits to the WIPP, that more letters are
19 written to Congress than any other thing against WIPP.
20 All this stuff is going into the oceans, the rivers,
21 the WIPP. All of them are infecting the whole world,
22 New Mexico, the United States. Just 12 miles standard
23 isn't big enough. We need a big environmental impact
24 statement for a lot more than what they are planning.

25 MR. BROWN: Phil Goldstone. And Rick Holmes

1 will be next.

2 MR. GOLDSTONE: I'm Phil Goldstone, I'm a
3 resident of Santa Fe and an employee of Los Alamos
4 National Laboratory. And I've been at these hearings
5 before as Greg and Jay and Beckie may remember,
6 although this is the first time I actually know the
7 clown.

8 But I'm here speaking as a private person,
9 not for the laboratory. I want to note that I support
10 the preferred alternative and the assignments to Los
11 Alamos in the PEIS because it is the best, most
12 appropriate way to support U.S. national security and
13 to support the continuation of the stockpile
14 stewardship program which as I recall was first
15 started by President Clinton.

16 In fact, the activities proposed in the
17 preferred alternative are necessary for any future
18 stockpile as long as it doesn't go immediately to
19 zero. And will survive any change that we might see
20 for the foreseeable future including the enabling of a
21 much smaller stockpile.

22 It's also true that that program will support
23 a lot of other capabilities that the laboratory uses
24 to leverage, for other national security important
25 interests, for energy interests, for support to other

1 agencies. And those capabilities are necessary to
2 sustain.

3 I also believe that from what I know, the
4 laboratory will conduct this activity in an
5 environmentally sound manner. I've been through a
6 number of times where I've supported the department
7 and I know how conservative they are, in fact, in
8 analyzing the impacts of actions at the laboratory and
9 elsewhere.

10 I also know from looking at my colleagues how
11 carefully they worry about being safe, about avoiding
12 pollution, about avoiding harm to the public. In
13 fact, there's more attention to safety and security
14 and to the environment at Los Alamos than I've seen in
15 a lot of activities in Santa Fe.

16 I appreciate that everybody here has sincere
17 concerns to make sure that their environment is not
18 disrupted by this. It's an appropriate purpose for a
19 NEPA hearing, it's appropriate dialogue to have. I do
20 believe I've heard a lot of misinformation here
21 tonight and I've seen bandied around in the papers.

22 But to get real, a lot of what you are about,
23 a lot of the comments I have heard are actually not
24 opposing the preferred alternative per se but opposing
25 the continuation of any nuclear weapons program in the

1 United States.

2 The long-term goal of nuclear disarmament is
3 a long-term goal. But the abrupt disruption of our
4 ability to support our nuclear stockpile would, in
5 fact, be severely dangerous to the United States,
6 would not affect the intent of other nations to
7 proliferate in other cases. And I think it's a severe
8 mistake. Thank you.

9 MR. BROWN: Rick Holmes. Joe Martz will
10 follow. And Henry who is our timer will hold up a one
11 minute sign when there's one minute remaining and then
12 he'll hold up the sign of when your time is up.

13 MR. HOLMES: Good evening. My name is Rick
14 Holmes and I am the CMRR program director at Los
15 Alamos. I also happen to live here in town, but I'm
16 here as the CMRR program director. I want to try to
17 clean up a couple of things at least just to get it
18 into the record.

19 CMRR is not a new idea. As a number of you
20 have said before and know an awful lot about it, it's
21 been around for a long time. It is the replacement
22 facility for a building that was built in the 1950s.
23 It does have the modern technology and the safety
24 basis and thought put into it to be done properly.

25 I also have the privilege of leading the team

1 that is currently building the radiological laboratory
2 that's the building that was in the newspaper most
3 recently. I will tell you unequivocally that building
4 is on schedule and on budget.

5 We are doing this job. I have a lot of help
6 from a lot of dedicated professional people who work
7 at the laboratory of engineers and scientists to make
8 sure that we do this right. The radiological
9 laboratory is a lead -- will be submitted as a lead
10 silver certified facility. The nuclear facility, if
11 it's decided to be built, will also be submitted as a
12 lead certified facility.

13 Somebody raised up seismic questions earlier,
14 about the new seismic study. The nuclear facility
15 will be built using that data. And so that it will
16 survive that earthquake should it occur.

17 So we have the right -- I have the privilege
18 of leading the right group of people who are currently
19 building the radiological laboratory. And that's the
20 same right group of people who if we do decide, and I
21 think we should, to build a nuclear facility, to do it
22 right and properly.

23 We also try to have open and honest
24 communications. We have public meetings twice a year
25 to try to talk about the status of the project and try

1 to keep people informed as we go forward and do this
2 job. Thank you.

3 MR. BROWN: Kate Cooper will be next.

4 MR. MARTZ: Thank you. I'm Joe Martz, I'm a
5 plutonium scientist at Los Alamos for the last 25
6 years, and I speak as a private citizen. I have
7 attended a number of these hearings, not just tonight
8 but over the last 20 years.

9 And I listen with an ear of hope. I feel
10 much passion in this room. We might not always
11 together agree on methods or means. But I see hope in
12 that there's much common ground between us and hope
13 for our ultimate goals.

14 I came to the laboratory in 1983 inspired by
15 Hans Beta with a vision to find a way beyond the need
16 to threaten ourselves with thousands of nuclear
17 weapons to preserve peace. I chose a career at Los
18 Alamos working from the inside to find a way to move
19 beyond that need to wield the instruments of ultimate
20 destruction in order to preserve our species and our
21 race.

22 It is my belief that the work we do at the
23 laboratory and the work that has been proposed as part
24 of the preferred alternative will assist in that
25 regard. Now, I want to make two very brief points,

1 because I know we only have three minutes.

2 One, I want to establish some credibility.

3 This message I'm giving you tonight is not new. Those
4 of you who have known me and heard me speak for over
5 20 years know that I've been saying the same thing.
6 This is a lifelong passion of my own.

7 I have as much passion as many of you. It's
8 just a means that I've chosen. In fact, I look into
9 the audience and I see a lot of hopeful faces. I
10 would like to connect with many of you. So perhaps we
11 can find ways where we share common ground.

12 There's much to be commended in this proposal
13 that I think everyone in this room would agree on.
14 The consolidation of nuclear materials, the removal of
15 plutonium from the site in Livermore, bringing this
16 all under a single, well guarded, fenced-in facility
17 to improve the safety, to improve its security, to
18 reduce its environmental impacts.

19 There is one piece of science that I have
20 done over the years that I hope you would find that
21 you would agree with in large measure and I hope I can
22 establish some credibility with it. Myself, my
23 colleague Dave Clark who is here, and others were the
24 scientists who conducted the pit lifetime study.

25 We've studied plutonium aging for

1 approximately the last 11 years. Our conclusions form
2 the basis upon which this proposal could be made. Our
3 conclusions were the basis upon which a modern pit
4 facility was not needed by this country.

5 We gave an answer that science demanded, not
6 a politically correct answer. And that science was
7 enabled at Los Alamos on the basis of the work that
8 Dave Clark, myself, and others had conducted.

9 The other is a vision for nuclear disarmament
10 which I support and share. I just want to point out
11 the simple fact that from when I was born in 1965
12 until today, we've gotten rid of 90 percent of our
13 nuclear weapons. That's a remarkable accomplishment.

14 Yes, many of you want none. You would like
15 to see further progress. But let's at least take a
16 pause and celebrate that nine-tenths is not a bad
17 start. And we're simply trying to find means and
18 methods by which we can further reduce. And I've now
19 been shown the sign that my time is over. Thank you
20 have for your attention.

21 MR. BROWN: Bud Ryan will follow Kate Cooper.

22 MS. COOPER: My name is Kate, I'm from New
23 Mexico, I'm from Santa Fe. I'm 20 years old. And I'm
24 nervous, but I'll do my best. So I just I think that
25 we're all working for the same things.

1 Whether you're in Los Alamos or Santa Fe,
2 we're working to make a better world. You know, we
3 have scientists, you know, to focus on statistics, to
4 focus on logistics. We have these hippies who focus
5 on peace and, you know, these universal thoughts. And
6 they're all valid and they're all beautiful.

7 Now, what I see and what I'd like to ask you
8 guys is I feel that nuclear weapons do have a role
9 right now. I feel that if we were to get rid of all
10 of our nuclear weapons like you were saying, I feel
11 like it could be a threat.

12 I do, however, feel and from what I've
13 heard -- I've been traveling around with a group of
14 young people around New Mexico, talking to people from
15 all over Northern New Mexico about their water and how
16 polluted it actually is.

17 So what I would really like to see is I feel
18 right now there is pollution. And I feel that in
19 order to move forward, we have to make for certain,
20 for certain that there isn't going to be continuing
21 pollution. Because right now it's not meeting my
22 qualifications for the world that I want to create.

23 And so I would really -- I feel that we're
24 not ready to expand. Until we can prove without a
25 shadow of doubt, I challenge you guys to give -- I

1 challenge Los Alamos National Labs to give money to
2 tribes, you know, such as San Idelfonso, Cochiti.

3 I would like you to give them the money to
4 have tests done, objective, separate from the labs, so
5 that we can make certain that there isn't pollution.
6 And then I'd like to go back and reevaluate what's
7 going on, what do we need to do to make certain that
8 there is no pollution whatsoever.

9 And then we can talk about it, then we can
10 talk about it. I mean I hear your points about
11 consolidation, I feel that. But I feel that the most
12 important thing is to make sure without a shadow,
13 beyond a shadow of a doubt that New Mexico is
14 protected, the environment is protected.

15 And ultimately I know we all want to get rid
16 of nuclear weapons, period. And I know that you share
17 that because nobody wants to live in a world where
18 there is war and a world where people are being
19 killed. So I think all of us, we have to put our
20 brilliance, our minds, we have to put our gifts
21 together and we have to make sure we're going about it
22 in the right way.

23 MR. BROWN: Bud Ryan. Are you here? Charlie
24 McMillan.

25 MR. McMILLAN: Good evening. I'm Charlie

1 McMillan, I'm the associate director for weapons
2 physics at Los Alamos.

3 In thinking about my remarks this evening I
4 was reminded of some comments that I read from Freeman
5 Dyson about a decade ago. Many of you may know
6 Freeman Dyson as an excellent physicist and an
7 important thoughtful person.

8 And he wrote a book called Imagine Worlds in
9 1997. And the comment that I remembered was the
10 following -- I should put it in context. He was
11 thinking about a future world in which international
12 affairs don't require nuclear weapons. And he said
13 the time when we can say goodbye to nuclear weapons is
14 still far distant, too far to be envisioned, perhaps
15 100 years away. Until that time comes, we must live
16 with our weapons as responsibly and as quietly as we
17 can.

18 I support the PEIS because I believe it
19 allows us to live both responsibly and quietly. At a
20 personal level, I'm an experimental physicist. I have
21 worked with beryllium, plutonium, uranium, many of the
22 materials we're talking about here. I have lived for
23 the last 25 years in communities that are addressed in
24 this PEIS here in and at Livermore.

25 I have reared my three children here. I care

1 intensely about the environment that I live in, that I
2 work in, and that my children have grown up in. And I
3 believe this allows us to deal with that in a very
4 responsible way.

5 At a global level, I also believe that this
6 is responsible and quiet. First because I believe
7 this will enable us to have the U.S. stockpile be
8 smaller than it would otherwise be by not requiring us
9 to rely so heavily on spare nuclear weapons.

10 Second, I believe that this is important for
11 nonproliferation. There are countries in the world
12 that depend on our nuclear deterrent so they don't
13 have to build nuclear weapons themselves. If we fail
14 in our responsibility, they have the ability and may
15 well build them themselves.

16 Finally I think that this is responsible and
17 quiet for the United States. Should the day ever
18 come, perish the thought, when we have to rely again
19 on our nuclear weapons as we did in the past, they
20 will be there in a safe and quiet way. Thank you.

21 MR. BROWN: David Bacon. Then Audrey Jones
22 and Michael Collins will be next.

23 MR. BACON: Hello. I just want to say that
24 what we're doing is not right for myself. I'm 20.
25 What is my future going to be like? I've got friends

1 younger than me. My little sister, what is that going
2 to do for her future?

3 We need to take this money that we're using
4 for building nuclear bombs and spend it on education
5 so that thousands and millions of kids don't drop out
6 every year. We need to take a look at our
7 environment, like global warming, rainforests are
8 being cut down every single day. People are living in
9 poverty and what we're doing is building bombs. You
10 call that a fair thing?

11 And another thing I want to say is that why
12 are we building these when we want peace? I think we
13 all in this room want peace. And by building bombs is
14 not the right way and using them against innocent
15 people. And even if they're not, negotiate, don't
16 kill them. So that's what I want to say.

17 MR. BROWN: Michael Collins. And Mike
18 Mallory will follow Michael Collins.

19 MR. COLLINS: I think I saw eight police cars
20 out in front initially when I first came in. I'm glad
21 the police are here to keep an eye on all these crazy
22 scientists. Nothing personal. It's just your work.

23 The other thing before I read some basic
24 questions here, someone mentioned us being blessed. I
25 think the people in Los Alamos are blessed with our

1 taxpayers' money. And they said something about they
2 brought all the money for Northern New Mexico. To me
3 it's blood money and I would rather go without it
4 frankly, I don't care how many billions there are.

5 And furthermore to talk about safe
6 scientists, somebody said that just a few minutes ago.
7 Safe scientists? You know, it's hard being civil with
8 this bullshit going on. We're talking about murder.
9 Has anyone ever watched and looked at the victims of
10 Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I know everyone said it was
11 necessary. That's bull. Some of those people are
12 still barely existing.

13 I just have some basic questions. I want to
14 say they're basically yes or no answers. You know, I
15 tried to make them real simple so I didn't get
16 convoluted.

17 But, for instance, do you, the Department of
18 Energy, or its contractors think every aspect of the
19 weapons program at LANL is under control including
20 contamination of groundwater? Would you drink water
21 from the Buchman wells or from Cochiti Lake both
22 downstream from LANL on a daily basis and give it to
23 your babies or family?

24 How is the Los Alamos National Laboratory
25 weapons program different from Rocky Flats or Hanford

1 regarding the need for cleanup, the need to be closed,
2 and the need to be declared a Superfund site. Why was
3 Rocky Flats closed?

4 Based on the Rocky Flats and Hanford
5 standards, should LANL be closed? I think so too.
6 Why do we or you need several thousand plutonium pit
7 triggers, why do you need to produce new ones and
8 what's wrong with the existing stockpile?

9 Is it not true that the pits are expected to
10 last from 50 to a century or more, 50 years to a
11 century or more? Will increased production of nuclear
12 pits violate the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty which
13 was ratified by the U.S. in 1970? Has a possibility
14 of treaty violation even been considered?

15 If the entire DOE tiger team showed up at Los
16 Alamos tonight or at any time, do you, LANL, or its
17 contractor believe the lab would meet inspection
18 standards and not have any problems. What issues or
19 problems exist now that you are aware of or do you
20 foresee in the future?

21 Have hazardous radioactive materials from
22 LANL entered the groundwater now, March 2008, or have
23 they ever at Los Alamos? My understanding is that
24 once water tables or aquifers have been contaminated,
25 you cannot go back and remediate them to their

1 previous safe pristine status.

2 Is there any need for hazardous radioactive
3 concern or cleanup in the counties of Los Alamos,
4 Santa Fe, or Rio Arriba or at San Idelfonso Pueblo or
5 at any pueblo? I'm almost finished.

6 Will DOE or its contractors or the Los Alamos
7 city or county government ever return to San Idelfonso
8 Pueblo, the land they took from the pueblo over the
9 years, and, if so, when. And if financial
10 compensation had occurred, was that sufficient for the
11 pueblo?

12 Would Northern New Mexico be better off
13 environmentally or health and safety-wise if there was
14 no weapons work at Los Alamos? Thank you.

15 MR. BROWN: Mike Mallory is next. Steve
16 Porter will follow. And the court reporter said that
17 if you have printed copies of your remarks that are
18 available, you may hand them off to her when you're
19 completed. Thanks.

20 MR. MALLORY: Thank you. My name is Mike
21 Mallory, I work at the laboratory, and I appreciate
22 the opportunity to make some very brief remarks
23 tonight.

24 And let me begin by expressing my personal
25 belief based on 30 years of working in the nuclear

1 weapons complex at the Kansas City plant, at the
2 Pantex facility, and now at the laboratory that the
3 preferred alternative is the best choice for our
4 nation and our national interests.

5 And I believe the preferred alternative
6 should be adopted because the department's proposed
7 centers of excellence and that approach to modernizing
8 the U.S. weapons complex makes the most efficient use
9 of existing resources.

10 For Los Alamos Laboratory's selection as the
11 center of plutonium excellence makes good sense. It's
12 what the laboratory does, that's where plutonium work
13 is done in the United States, it makes use of those
14 facilities.

15 It dramatically combines the nuclear
16 materials in the United States, makes it easier to
17 protect these materials. Most of the investment is
18 going to be made to make the existing facilities safer
19 and more secure, upgrade some facilities that were
20 built during World War II to get them to the point
21 where they can be maintained safely for the employees
22 and the community. Thank you very much.

23 MR. BROWN: Steve Porter. And the next
24 speaker, and you may have to help me on this last
25 name, Dominique Mazeauol.

1 MS. MAZEAUOL: Hello. My name is Dominique
2 Mazeauol, I'm a resident of Santa Fe County. I'm here
3 to speak against the production of all plutonium pit
4 triggers for nuclear warheads at LANL. Why? First
5 the United States was one of the signatories of the
6 nonproliferation treaty.

7 The international community has worked for
8 decades to create a nuclear nonproliferation climate
9 which would help prevent the spread of nuclear
10 weapons. The proposed complex transformation makes
11 the United States look like a hypocrite. Do as I say,
12 not as I do.

13 At the time when the U.S. Government is
14 demanding other countries to adhere to the NPT and
15 renounce nuclear weapons, the U.S. Government is not
16 meeting its own obligation to pursue disarmament.
17 With this kind of attitude, what kind of leverage can
18 the United States have in negotiating with countries
19 that have or may want to have nuclear arm goals.

20 Why is this so-called complex transformation
21 a bad idea? Politicians forget that these labs and
22 bomb making factories are a great risk to public
23 health and environment in New Mexico.

24 At a higher level of pit production, LANL
25 could increase airborne pollutants by 28 percent.

1 Precious natural resources would be stretched to the
2 limit as the lab's current water rights would be
3 exceeded by 10 percent at a time when we all know we
4 are all scrambling for water to grow food, et cetera.

5 Operations at the Los Alamos National
6 Laboratory put dangerous chemicals into our original
7 aquifer and LANL's monitoring wells, quote, unquote,
8 fail to do their job. There is a whole list of
9 radioactive contaminants I will skip.

10 So much positive transformative work needs to
11 be done, like take serious monthly sampling of
12 drinking water wells, using the best technology,
13 install new wells that will comply with all
14 environmental laws, quality, and regulations.

15 Three, establish an independent review of
16 LANL's entire water quality detail base, et cetera. I
17 also bring up as another point the incoming President
18 to complete a new nuclear posture in 2009. So what is
19 the rush?

20 And to conclude, in my book the word
21 transformation has a positive connotation. In a world
22 mired by the greatest threat which is the breakdown of
23 the environment through global warming, why not put
24 our heads together and transform the laboratories into
25 life affirming activities, like developing sound

1 alternative and energy solutions. There are many
2 brilliant scientists over there waiting for this
3 change of mission. Thank you.

4 MR. BROWN: Our next speaker is Catherine
5 Montano. She'll be followed by Dorothy Dean.

6 MS. MONTANO: My name is Catherine Montano.
7 And I'm against this plutonium pit and core
8 production. When the FBI raided Rocky Flats, they had
9 a plutonium pit and core production that contaminated
10 the ecosystems of Colorado.

11 Los Alamos has continued to poison the
12 ecosystems of New Mexico and the world and they must
13 be stopped. It is a criminal act to continue to make
14 nuclear weapons because it does not matter where we
15 drop this bomb, mother earth is a living organism.

16 And our soldiers are being contaminated right
17 along with the enemy. And the sad part is the Iraqis
18 were not our enemy, they're innocent people. The same
19 with the people in Japan, they were innocent when we
20 dropped those bombs on them.

21 We need to use the Constitution of the United
22 States of America and also of New Mexico. And I would
23 like to read some constitutional law.

24 I am addressing this to the President of the
25 United States and also our Vice President, Ron Curry,

1 Secretary of the Environment of New Mexico, Governor
2 Bill Richardson, Lieutenant Governor Diane Denish, all
3 state senators and representatives and all of
4 Congress, gentle people, this is a lawful notification
5 to you pursuant to the Bill of Rights of the New
6 Mexico Constitution, in particular the 1st, 4th, 5th,
7 6th, and 9th amendments of the Bill of Rights of the
8 New Mexico Constitution, in particular, Article 2,
9 section 1, 2, 3, 4, 17, and 18 is pursuant to your
10 oath and requires your urgent action to vote and speak
11 up on behalf of and represent the people and
12 environment of New Mexico specific to the subject
13 matter.

14 As elected and appointed representatives of
15 the people, the sovereignty in this nation, you are
16 required pursuant to your oath and constitutional
17 mandates contained therein to uphold rights guaranteed
18 by the constitution to the people to act in the public
19 interest and to uphold the public good.

20 Nuclear contamination is in direct violation
21 of the constitutional requirements, a right guaranteed
22 to the people. You and government are required to
23 deal and act lawfully with the people. Yet by your
24 own actions, you have dealt unlawfully with the people
25 and officially oppose the rights, the best interests,

1 and their good.

2 Mother earth already has a degree of fever
3 caused by radioactivity and not knowing how to protect
4 our missing ozone. The one degree has already upset
5 the earth's metabolism and caused many fish in the sea
6 to migrate into colder waters. It is causing ice caps
7 and glaziers to melt, et cetera.

8 Actually the degree registers a bit more
9 above one degree and rising. Less than ten degrees
10 more of radioactivity fever will make our planet a
11 barren waste. And you know, people, it must stop,
12 this nuclear madness must stop.

13 And Los Alamos is grossly contaminated.
14 Yesterday we had a WIPP truck that went off the road
15 in Las Vegas. And I understand that the WIPP driver
16 was very sick and he actually passed out. And these
17 poor drivers are being grossly contaminated and it
18 needs to stop.

19 We are tired of all of this. We urge you to
20 act on behalf of the citizens you are sworn to serve,
21 to oppose plutonium pits and core production at Los
22 Alamos, forbid any future actions regarding nuclear
23 radiation and mining of production in New Mexico.

24 If you fail to serve your constitutional
25 actions and do not stop this very real threat to the

1 health and well-being of the people of New Mexico,
2 then we as citizens, sworn to oppose, quote, all
3 enemies of this land, both foreign and domestic, shall
4 not hesitate to file criminal charges and bring civil
5 action against you personally in your professional
6 capacity for the crimes against the people of New
7 Mexico and the world.

8 And I just want to say that all these elected
9 and appointed officials have taken an oath to the
10 Constitution of the United States and of New Mexico.
11 And it is time that we use that instrument because
12 that is the only way and the only effective way that
13 we are going to stop the nuclear madness.

14 All atomic activity must cease upon the
15 earth. There is no safe way of storing it or
16 disposing of it and nuclear facilities are making too
17 much of it. This is the greatest crime to humanity
18 and all life on the planet. We must stop the nuclear
19 madness, it is out of hand and it is a criminal act to
20 continue.

21 MR. BROWN: Dorothy Dean.

22 MS. MONTANO: That accident was in Las Vegas,
23 New Mexico.

24 MR. BROWN: And Susie Knight will follow
25 Dorothy.

1 MS. DEAN: Hello. My name is Dorothy Dean
2 and I grew up in Arvada, Colorado, which is ten miles
3 southeast of Rocky Flats. I grew up in an era of
4 fear, fear of nuclear disasters.

5 I saw films made in the days after the
6 bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki when I was in high
7 school. And we saw the suffering of innocent people,
8 grandmothers, and babies burned severely by radiation.
9 I don't think any of us in this room can imagine
10 another dropping of an atomic bomb, let alone the
11 hydrogen bombs and all the things that have come since
12 then.

13 In the mid 1970s, a nonviolent movement grew
14 up on the tracks which led from Rocky Flats
15 transporting the plutonium pit trigger bombs out into
16 the ever expanding military industrial complex.
17 Dwight D. Eisenhower warned against this huge taxpayer
18 funded nonsustainable economic scenario, the nightmare
19 of national debt we're living in today.

20 This economy of selling weapons and
21 instilling fear in generations is ill conceived.
22 Selling false solutions of nuclear proliferation as
23 part of our capacity to respond to an uncertain future
24 is dangerous.

25 We knew this at Rocky Flats. It took 20

1 years, it took Chernobyl, it took Three Mile Island,
2 it took really brave people, really intelligent
3 scientists and people who worked within the Rocky
4 Flats, whistleblowers, and an FBI raid to shut it down
5 20 years later.

6 This environmental impact statement is
7 meaningless without independent noncorrupt, monetary
8 oversight. And we all know that's not going to
9 happen. We need our clean water to survive. We are
10 already over extended with our water.

11 We need to find ways of cleaning up the
12 existing pollution in Los Alamos before we -- we care
13 about the mental and physical health of our
14 communities. We want to find solutions, not fund
15 corporations who will profit from the production of
16 new pit bombs.

17 We do not want to proliferate nuclear
18 weapons, we want to foster peace. I am much more
19 concerned about the threat to our safety and national
20 security from within the United States than from
21 without.

22 And then with the words of Michael Francy, we
23 can bomb the world to pieces, but we can't bomb it
24 into peace. We need a Department of Peace, we need to
25 fund peace as much as we fund nuclear proliferation.

1 Thanks.

2 MR. BROWN: Susie Knight. Jon Ventura. Jon
3 will be followed by Shea Goodluck-Barnes.

4 MR. VENTURA: Good evening. My name is Jon
5 Ventura. My wife and I have been staff members of the
6 weapons program at Los Alamos National Lab for almost
7 four years. We are residents of Los Alamos County.

8 I have carefully read the documentation
9 associated with the preferred alternative and believe
10 it to be the best plan to ensure the scientific and
11 technical excellence of Los Alamos National Laboratory
12 for decades to come. Therefore, I endorse the
13 preferred alternative and hope to see it incorporated
14 into the record of decision.

15 The men and women at Los Alamos are the most
16 dedicated and talented people working to preserve,
17 protect, and defend the blessings of liberty that we
18 all enjoy as evidenced by tonight's discussion. Our
19 contributions have helped preserve world peace and
20 prosperity for more than 65 years with both nuclear
21 and non-nuclear contributions.

22 Let me provide a few examples of the
23 non-nuclear initiatives we are involved in. LANL
24 scientists are developing detailed computer models to
25 track and predict disease pandemics including avian

1 flu and smallpox.

2 Lab staff working with our colleagues at
3 Lawrence Livermore developed and deployed a system
4 known as basis to detect pathogens such as anthrax at
5 the Salt Lake City Olympics, Superbowls, and World
6 Series.

7 Lab engineers are working with the Department
8 of Homeland Security on nuclear detection systems for
9 the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey. LANL
10 for the last 40 years has trained nearly all of the
11 International Atomic Energy Agency safeguards
12 inspectors.

13 LANL technologies including advanced body
14 armor and the Angel Fire surveillance system are at
15 work today protecting U.S. troops who through their
16 heroism are helping to secure the freedoms guaranteed
17 by the U.S. Constitution.

18 This is the kind of work we do at Los Alamos
19 today. And we are able to do it because of our core
20 national security responsibilities. Thank you for
21 listening to me.

22 MR. BROWN: Shea Goodluck-Barnes and David
23 Clark will be next.

24 MS. GOODLUCK-BARNES: I am Shea, they call me
25 Shea for short. I am a grandmother, I am an

1 ambassador of the clan called Nacudenai. I am born of
2 that clan. My father's clan is the House of Red. My
3 paternal grandparent clan is the Big Water. And my
4 maternal grandparent clan is the Hypnotic Rock Clan.

5 I want to ask you relatives to just be where
6 you are and shut your eyes. I'm not going to set off
7 a bomb, I promise. Just shut your eyes and envision
8 your birth, that sacred birth that we all are.

9 We floated out of our mother's womb, out of
10 that amniotic fluid where it was safe and we floated
11 gently for many months. Take a deep breath. Remember
12 that first breath of life you took at the time of your
13 sacred birth.

14 We're all a sacred birth. And I stand here
15 before you a grandmother. I am ashamed by what we
16 have come to be as a human race. Grandmothers from
17 long ago sat before the fireplace and they lit their
18 sage or their cedar and they said oh, help us, help us
19 humankind, we are pitiful.

20 Indeed we are, what we've done to ourselves
21 and to one another. This night I just want to remind
22 us and me as a grandmother, I'm reminding myself, I
23 acknowledge this moment. The spirit of the fire, the
24 spirit of the air, the spirit of the water, I want to
25 acknowledge all our relatives, the winged ones, those

1 who hop, those who crawl, the four-legged, those who
2 swim, and the dancing creatures.

3 I want to remember the rock people, the green
4 brothers and sisters, and the mountains. I want to
5 acknowledge every walk on this mother earth. I come
6 from across the street over here. I work with people
7 who have been excluded from even their own families
8 because they have mental illness and they are homeless
9 in a great country.

10 Why do we have relatives who are homeless and
11 hungry, why are our children going hungry? Now I
12 think who is really losing their mind? The people I
13 sit with every day? I live with them, I take care of
14 them. Or is it the people who are very educated and
15 profess to be our leaders?

16 I shall think about that as I lay my head
17 down this evening. There's more I want to say. I've
18 been speaking for -- I've done over 500 speaking
19 engagements all over the world. You know what, I'm
20 proud to be an ambassador of the ancient wisdom of my
21 people because I do not understand technology talk.

22 But I'm okay with me as I am today. After
23 all, we've only been waiting 500 years to be heard. I
24 have more to say, I get diarrhea of the mouth, believe
25 me. But I'm honored to have said so much just as a

1 reminder to each one of us. Thank you.

2 MR. CLARK: I'd like to start by thanking
3 everybody for sticking around so late in the evening
4 and giving everybody an opportunity to talk.

5 My name is David Clark and I'm a Los Alamos
6 National Laboratory fellow. I've devoted my career to
7 cleaning up the legacy of the Cold War. My personal
8 efforts have reduced the number of nuclear weapons and
9 cleaned up environmental contamination.

10 I submit to you that these goals are the same
11 as the many concerned citizens groups that have been
12 present and participated in these hearings. We only
13 differ by the means that we choose to achieve these
14 goals.

15 For the record I support the complex
16 transformation because it represents to me a natural
17 and logical means to achieve the legacy cleanup goal.
18 It will cut the size of the nuclear weapons complex in
19 half, it will support reducing the number of nuclear
20 weapons, it will replace aging facilities with
21 state-of-the-art laboratories with better safety,
22 better security, and better environmental compliance.

23 I want to return for a minute to the concepts
24 of the means that we use to achieve our goals. We all
25 have different approaches. In my case I achieved

1 enough scientific credentials that I could get the
2 government to listen to me.

3 I helped develop the scientific understanding
4 of plutonium contamination at Rocky Flats and that did
5 enable the most significant cleanup in the history of
6 Superfund legislation. And for Astrid it wasn't
7 perfect. Nothing is ever perfect.

8 But it was far, far better than leaving that
9 sit up there outside a major metropolitan area. For
10 the record, we did clean up 385 acres of industrial
11 complex. We decontaminated and we removed 805
12 concrete buildings. And we remediated 98,000 tons of
13 contaminated soil. For the record that saved
14 \$30 billion of taxpayer money.

15 I listened to you, you can listen to me.

16 Moreover, in support of the Moscow Treaty, my
17 colleagues just destroyed one-third of a metric ton of
18 plutonium pits. Now, surely that's worth an applause
19 in this audience. And they propose to continue that
20 pace every year.

21 And I know that you don't understand the
22 logic. But pit destruction far exceeds the limited
23 manufacturing that's being discussed. And at the end
24 of the day, my approach working within the system with
25 my colleagues is achieving positive results. We have

1 reduced the number of nuclear --

2 MR. BROWN: Let him finish, please. David,
3 go ahead.

4 MR. CLARK: That's fine. So I have provided
5 my facts. I ask each of you to consider whether you
6 believe that your approach has been equally
7 successful. If you agree with me and my colleagues at
8 the labs that are working on these problems, then we
9 could use your support. Thank you for your attention.

10 MR. BROWN: The next name I have is Avree Fe.
11 She will be followed by Ron Simmons.

12 MS. FE: Hi. I'm Avree and I'm 15 years old.
13 And I would just like to say that I hope that you
14 consider that there are people that are going to be
15 here in 50 and 75 years. And I don't want to have to
16 deal with the aftermath of bad decisions. Thank you.

17 MR. BROWN: Ron Simmons. Kent Scotten, is
18 Kent here? Krista Elrick. Tom Starke. Tom will be
19 followed by -- I'll have to check. Go ahead, Tom.

20 MR. STARKE: Thank you. My name is Tom
21 Starke, I work at Los Alamos in the environmental
22 cleanup department. I've been there for 27 years. I
23 previously worked at the weapons program.

24 And I think one of the most important things
25 that's been said by several speakers is just the

1 desire to build down nuclear weapons to whatever the
2 lowest possible level, hopefully zero, that we can get
3 to. I think many of us that work at the laboratory
4 have been motivated by that goal for some time.

5 And I think as we look at building down, one
6 of the things that's really important is maintaining
7 our confidence and our ability to manage, to repair,
8 to monitor, to maintain the weapons that are still in
9 the stockpile as we carry out the national directives
10 for how the country wants the nuclear weapons program
11 to evolve and to go.

12 And I think this complex transformation with
13 the distributed complex is the best way to go. I
14 strongly recommend it. I think it both protects
15 taxpayer resources, balancing it with implementing the
16 national objectives in nuclear weapons.

17 From an environmental point of view, I also
18 believe this plan is the best one for carrying out the
19 mission while protecting the environment. I also know
20 that the water that we drink in Los Alamos is safe. I
21 know my coworkers support this plan.

22 And I know their children -- I live in Santa
23 Fe. I drink the water that's pumped out of the
24 Buchman wells. I know that water is safe. I know the
25 water pumped from beneath Los Alamos is safe. And I

1 believe with the Buchman diversion process is in, it
2 will also produce safe water.

3 And I believe the people at Los Alamos
4 working there intend to do everything possible, that
5 no activity at Los Alamos under this new plan will do
6 anything to compromise the safety of the water that
7 the people in Northern New Mexico drink. Thank you
8 very much.

9 MR. BROWN: Our next speaker is Wippie the
10 radioactive clown. I wasn't quite sure who that was.
11 But here he is. Betty Sperlich will follow Wippie.

12 MR. WIPPIE THE RADIOACTIVE CLOWN: Ladies and
13 gentlemen, boys and girls, I am glowing with
14 excitement to be here tonight with the opportunity to
15 absorb more radiation.

16 I am the founding and only member of Santa
17 Feans for a Radioactive Tomorrow. Our motto is
18 mutation is evolution. And you are providing us, our
19 children, our grandchildren, their grandchildren,
20 their great, great grandchildren for 10,000 years with
21 the opportunity to mutate and evolve. Every member of
22 Santa Feans for a Radioactive Tomorrow is excited.

23 I brought this bomb sound pen with me to
24 emphasize certain points. And the chance to absorb
25 more radiation certainly deserves a bomb sound. Oh.

1 Well, that wasn't exactly a bomb sound.

2 You know, a lot of people in this room seem
3 to be scared of this facility. They think that
4 because of the utterly deplorable safety record of Los
5 Alamos and the nuclear industry in general, that
6 you'll accidentally release radiation. Well, of course,
7 you will.

8 They just don't see the big picture like you
9 and I do. They don't see that this provides them and
10 the next 500 generations the opportunity to mutate and
11 evolve. I ask you, who doesn't need an extra set of
12 hands sometimes? How about two extra arms? Everyone
13 knows that two heads are better than one.

14 I am growing a nice long tail with a very
15 fluffy end. Ooh la la, votre queue est kree e
16 magnifique. The ladies will enjoy it very much I'm
17 sure. Well, this certainly does deserve a bomb sound.

18 You know, first you guys put a bunch of
19 radioactive waste in a collapsing salt mine on top of
20 the water table down at WIPP and now a plutonium
21 manufacturing facility 20 miles from a city. You guys
22 come up with the craziest wackiest ideas. And I
23 thought I was the clown.

24 There's a lot of talk about sustainability
25 these days. And them Bechtel boys that run the lab

1 really understand this well. First they get paid to
2 make a radioactive mess, then they get paid to clean
3 it up. That's a sustainable business model, not solar
4 panels.

5 Well, to conclude I've got to commend the
6 Bechtel and all the LANL employees for sitting here
7 and pretending that anything that gets said by anyone
8 in this audience is actually important. And I know by
9 the fact that they're sitting there very calmly and
10 smiling that my tax dollars are being well spent.

11 So I'm going to conclude with this. Why did
12 the two plutonium pits fall in love? The answer:
13 Because they melted down each other's hearts. Thank
14 you for the opportunity to mutate and evolve.

15 MR. BROWN: Betty will be followed by Sheila
16 Burns.

17 MS. SPERLICH: Hello. My name is Betty
18 Sperlich and I am speaking as a labor and delivery
19 nurse, as a mother, and as a cancer survivor.

20 You know, when I was sitting in the audience
21 here, I was thinking of something that I used to do as
22 a child in the fifties when I was at school. And we
23 used to have this little drill. Our teachers would
24 take us to do this little drill to protect us in case
25 of a nuclear bomb.

1 We would hide under our desks. That was the
2 thinking of the government then to protect us. And I
3 really just wonder how far the government thinking has
4 come since then.

5 What science says and the whole world now
6 needs is sustainability and peace. We all know that.
7 Plutonium and the proliferation of nuclear bombs means
8 neither. You don't need to be an Einstein to know
9 that you can't simultaneously prepare for war and for
10 peace.

11 Los Alamos needs to clean up its act now.
12 And by this I mean clean up the earth, the air, and
13 the water that we know that they have polluted. It's
14 a criminal act. We need to shut down weapons
15 production at Los Alamos now and transform it in a
16 true transformation to a laboratory for peace. Thank
17 you.

18 MR. BROWN: Sheila Burns.

19 MS. MONTANO: A lot of these people from Los
20 Alamos had their meeting at Los Alamos last night and
21 they spoke in Los Alamos and a lot of us traveled long
22 distance to come and speak here. So they should not
23 be getting up there again to speak when they spoke at
24 Los Alamos.

25 MR. BROWN: A number of folks on both sides

1 of the issue have spoken at a number of the hearings.
2 So let me run through the list. I don't see a lot of
3 real familiar names on the next list of speakers. Let
4 me call Sheila Burns. Jessie Emerson. Jessie is
5 here. Elliott Shimmer. Okay. Skinner.

6 MS. BURNS: I am here to speak for those who
7 have no voice. I am speaking for the standing still
8 people, for the plant people, for the trees, the
9 shrubs, the flowers, the grass. I am speaking for all
10 the four legs, for those that fly, for those that
11 creep and crawl, for those that swim in the water.

12 When I woke up this morning, I was told that
13 this was what I needed to do. Nobody consults with
14 the other members of our planet. We are not the only
15 ones who live under the sun. The plant people asked
16 me to bring up the thought that we should be planting
17 seeds of peace and not building more bombs. They
18 wanted me to ask what is wrong with the human species,
19 that we are fighting with each other, that we can't
20 come to some sort of agreement?

21 I was out whale watching in January. And
22 they have questions. Why have we dumped nuclear waste
23 into our oceans? Why are we dumping it into the water
24 we drink? We have to think that we are not alone on
25 this planet. We share it with all of life. What we

1 do to one part of the web affects the others.

2 We don't need more weapons, we don't need
3 more uranium out of the ground. It was put there to
4 be safe. What we need is more loving and more caring.
5 Caring enough to plant the seeds of peace and love and
6 not death and destruction. Thank you.

7 MR. BROWN: Elliott Skinner. And Bobby
8 Besold is next.

9 MR. SKINNER: I was born in Boulder,
10 Colorado. And I lived next to what was called the
11 Rocky Mountain Arsenal. Even as a young person, I
12 thought it was a little crazy when I heard that there
13 were open barrels of nerve gas at the end of the
14 runway of the airport in Denver. That evolved or
15 transformed into Rocky Flats.

16 Then I had the pleasure when I came to Santa
17 Fe 48 years ago to live in houses that look out at
18 Technical Area 55. A lot of people in Santa Fe don't
19 realize that when they look over to the Jemez at night
20 that they're looking at Technical Area 55, the heart
21 of the beast.

22 They think they're looking at Los Alamos.
23 Well, if they look more closely, they see a few
24 twinkling lights off to the right which is Los Alamos
25 and a few twinkling lights off to the left which is

1 White Rock. Those lights at TA-55 never go off, if
2 you notice, all night.

3 And I think they should remind each of us of
4 what's been said by so many people tonight. They can
5 serve as a reminder for us to keep up our witness.
6 When I step out of our house or look out the kitchen
7 window, I literally feel sick to my stomach; and I
8 have felt that way for 48 years, because I'm looking
9 at evil, I am literally looking at evil.

10 That word hasn't been used much here tonight.
11 It's been suggested. But it's a word that I think
12 applies. Even though as Rebecca Procter pointed out,
13 the strategy of bureaucratic totalitarianism is to say
14 we decide the scope of what's relevant and what isn't
15 relevant. Every talk I've given at one of these
16 hearings has been ruled irrelevant and I'm proud of
17 that. And I've even checked it out in the index.

18 So I think that it's time for us to keep the
19 faith that we know what's right and we know what's
20 wrong and we know that creating bombs to kill people
21 and to damage the earth is wrong. It will never be
22 right. And it has to stop.

23 MR. BROWN: The next name I have is Bobby
24 Besold. Is Bobby here? Okay. Jim Hall. And Bruce
25 Gollub. Jim Hall is here and Bruce Gollub will

1 follow.

2 MR. HALL: My name is Jim Hall, I'm chair of
3 the Los Alamos County Council. I'm going to you as a
4 private citizen tonight primarily about two things,
5 some things that were said last night in Los Alamos
6 that I need to correct.

7 One is they talked about cancer incidents in
8 Los Alamos. There's two studies that are referenced
9 here. One is in 1993, a detailed study of cancer
10 incidents in Los Alamos by the Department of Health
11 and the State of New Mexico and the Tumor Registry at
12 the University of New Mexico.

13 And the basic outcomes of that study, the
14 basic outcome of that study was the cancer incident in
15 Los Alamos is lower than the average of New Mexico.
16 Some much lower. There are two or three cancers that
17 are high, ovarian cancer and breast cancer. Remember
18 these are small numbers, we're talking twos and threes
19 and zeros and fives and so on.

20 And the reason given in this study for that
21 possible increase in order to be able to determine, of
22 course, a specific increase was that Los Alamos people
23 have high risk factors. They reside in urban areas,
24 they have high socioeconomic status, and they don't
25 have their first children until late in life.

1 Those are all risk factors for those cancers.
2 There's also a high incidence of thyroid cancer. And
3 that was -- there was a further study done after that
4 to try and figure that out with no specific result.

5 Following up on that, this last year, if we
6 look at the New Mexico health statistics report in
7 2005, the latest available, published by the
8 Department of Vital Statistics, we see that the county
9 with the least mortality from cancer in this state is
10 Los Alamos.

11 So if you want to live without cancer, move
12 to Los Alamos. And by the way our wells are upstream
13 of the Buchman wells. Okay. They're closer to the
14 sources of contamination than the Buchman wells.

15 One other quick thing I would like to
16 mention. We've talked about the no-build option. The
17 United States has tried the no-build option for the
18 last 15 years. We dismantled critical parts of our
19 nuclear weapons -- of our nuclear weapons
20 manufacturing capability 15 years ago.

21 We haven't been able to build a new nuclear
22 weapons series for 15 years. Let's talk about the
23 result of that for nuclear weapons of the world.
24 During that time which has been a well-known fact,
25 China has completely rebuilt their nuclear weapons

1 facilities and are continuing to build nuclear
2 weapons.

3 Russia just declared a new pit facility
4 capable of 1,000 pits a year and has put six new
5 weapons systems into their arsenal. Britain and
6 France have both upgraded their nuclear weapons
7 facilities. And we have two new nuclear weapons
8 states at least, India and Pakistan. For that reason
9 I would suggest that the no-build option manifestly
10 doesn't work.

11 MR. BROWN: Bruce Gollub. Marilyn Hoff is
12 next. The court reporter has asked for a brief break
13 so we'll take a real brief break after Marilyn.

14 MS. HOFF: Can you hear me? Nuclear weapons
15 represent the triumph of dishonor in modern warfare
16 that increasingly targets independent civilians. Past
17 wars, however, hypocritically at least pretended that
18 killing would be limited to combatants.

19 But nothing kills more indiscriminately than
20 nuclear weapons. The indiscriminate killing of
21 civilians for political ends is a veritable definition
22 of terrorism. The combination of this barbaric trend
23 is the present U.S. push for so-called usable nukes
24 whose new treaty violation design necessitates a new
25 design of plutonium pits.

1 Thus, a push for plutonium pit manufacturing
2 here at LANL is a push for actually employing these
3 usable weapons from hell, a promotion of unthinkable
4 acts of terrorism perpetrated in our names. Wholesale
5 murder commonly shrugged off as collateral damage is
6 now the unspoken but actual aim of this latest nuclear
7 boondoggle.

8 Plutonium, the raw material of this dark
9 scheme, is the most dangerous element on earth. Too
10 much of it too close together in one place can
11 accidentally go critical, killing anyone nearby. The
12 plutonium plant at Rocky Flats had no sprinkler system
13 because officials feared that plutonium could go
14 critical in the presence of water.

15 Plutonium is extremely chemically reactive.
16 Pure plutonium waste will bond with almost anything
17 including the barrel in which it is stored, corroding
18 them away until they leak. And expanding as it bonds,
19 it can make containers burst.

20 It bonds most readily with oxygen, making it
21 more flammable than a match. It is pyrophoric meaning
22 in certain shapes and sizes, it can spontaneously
23 ignite in the presence of air. Expect to have fires
24 the Atomic Energy Commission actually instructed the
25 workers of Rocky Flats.

1 Rocky Flats and its pit manufacturing
2 equipment now resides at LANL and played host to
3 hundreds of plutonium fires according to Len Ackland
4 in his book Making a Real Killing.

5 Plutonium burns hot enough to melt steel.
6 Burning converts it to a fume of particles light
7 enough to behave as a gas and easily inhaled into the
8 depths of your lungs where, if it remains, it is
9 almost certain to cause cancer. One 500 billionth of
10 a gram of plutonium was labeled a serious health risk
11 by even our lax U.S. regulators.

12 A plutonium fire got out of hand at Rocky
13 Flats. It was caused by the spontaneous combustion of
14 plutonium. This fire spread and burnt up the filters.
15 And that meant that plutonium smoke went into the
16 environment of Rocky Flats. That was only one of many
17 fires.

18 We don't want plutonium being manufactured in
19 our neighborhoods, not in backyards, we don't want it
20 in anybody's backyards, never again, anywhere on
21 earth. No more bombs.

22 MR. BROWN: Jeanne Green. She's here. Good.
23 Then Tim Glasco. If you're here, just raise your hand
24 so I know.

25 MS. GREEN: It's actually Joan Green, but

1 that's okay. To start with I think that people who
2 work at Los Alamos should not be given equal
3 consideration with their testimony since they have a
4 total conflict of interest. Who is paying their
5 salaries?

6 As a member of the common people, I and we
7 demand that Los Alamos National Laboratory be closed.
8 The U.S. is already in violation of the Nuclear
9 Nonproliferation Treaty. Ramping up production of new
10 nuclear weapons makes the U.S. the rogue state of the
11 world, with 24,000 nuclear bomb pits already in
12 existence.

13 We do not need more nuclear bombs, we do not
14 need any nuclear bombs. The nuclear bombs we do have
15 have become a liability stead of a means of security.
16 Presently unidentified individuals can perform
17 terrorist acts at anyplace or time. And the huge
18 amounts of plutonium and radioactive wastes located at
19 nuclear production sites across our country, from sea
20 to shining sea, including nuclear power facilities
21 that produce plutonium make our country all the more
22 endangered.

23 Nuclear bombs are no longer a deterrent.
24 Nuclear bomb facilities are instead making us all the
25 more vulnerable to attack. 1,914 nuclear bombs sit

1 within the greater Albuquerque area only one mile from
2 the airport. The nuclear bomb industry does not take
3 into consideration the lives and welfare of the over
4 half a million people living there.

5 There is no plan for a safe evacuation in the
6 case of an accident or terrorist attack. That is
7 because there is no way to protect ourselves from such
8 an event that would spew deadly radioactive
9 contamination everywhere. The same is true for Los
10 Alamos.

11 With tons of radioactive waste sitting above
12 ground in barrels at LANL, New Mexicans are even now
13 being exposed to carcinogenic and mutagenic toxins in
14 our air, water, soil, and food. New Mexicans are
15 becoming in the sterile language of our corporate war
16 profiteering administration collateral damage.

17 Upping production will quadruple the risks
18 and casualties especially among the sacrificial Native
19 American populations near the bomb factory.

20 The Los Alamos nuclear industry began in
21 secrecy without the knowledge or permission of the
22 people in this democracy, without even the Vice
23 President's knowledge at the time.

24 The legacy of secrecy and profit making over
25 the heads of our citizens makes a mockery of

1 democracy. The secrecy continues unabated with
2 unmarked highly radioactive shipments traveling our
3 highways, making all citizens vulnerable to exposure
4 to the most deadly materials known to humankind.

5 The mandate for LANL from the people is to
6 clean up the massive contamination at Los Alamos.
7 Then if the area is at all inhabitable, put our
8 talented, exquisitely intelligent scientists to work,
9 researching sustainable energy alternatives to secure
10 our future and mitigate the effects and speed of
11 global warming.

12 No more plutonium pits, nowhere, no way. The
13 nuclear bomb industry is obsolete and a dead end for
14 New Mexicans and the world. Thank you.

15 MR. BROWN: Linda Hibbs will follow Tim. Is
16 Linda here?

17 MR. GLASCO: My name is Tim Glasco. And I'm
18 here on behalf of the Los Alamos County Utilities
19 Department. As such I'm not here to speak either for
20 or against the PEIS but rather would like to offer
21 some clarifying statements regarding some testimony
22 that's been given here.

23 First of all I'd like to point out that Los
24 Alamos County has 12 drinking water wells in our
25 system, seven of which are in the path of potential

1 contamination, legacy contamination from LANL.
2 Because of this we are very concerned with all aspects
3 of the migration of contaminants and with the sampling
4 for those contaminants.

5 LANL maintains sentinel wells, monitoring
6 wells between the sources of the legacy contamination
7 and the seven municipal wells. Some of those
8 monitoring wells have problems, but some of them also
9 do not. And I'm not sure that's been made clear.

10 All of the Los Alamos County drinking water
11 wells are tested annually for a broad suite of
12 substances in cooperation with LANL. And additionally
13 specific wells are tested quarterly for certain
14 substances that are of particular concern. Examples
15 of those are hexavalent chromium and perchlorate.

16 There's a standing committee made up of LANL
17 and county utilities personnel who periodically review
18 the sampling schedule and make adjustments as
19 necessary by new data that's coming in or by the
20 history of data that we're seeing from the wells.

21 For comparison's sake, the Los Alamos County
22 water supply has always tested so clean that the New
23 Mexico Environment Department Drinking Water Bureau
24 has granted waivers from testing for most of the
25 substances regulated under the Safe Drinking Water Act

1 to a three-year cycle of sampling for safe drinking
2 water act compliance. Compare that with annual
3 sampling for contaminants.

4 Much has been made of the existence of
5 perchlorate in monitoring well No. 1. Now,
6 perchlorate in this well has fairly consistently shown
7 up in the range of two to three parts per billion
8 which would meet the requirements of most states that
9 regulate perchlorate. There is no federal or state
10 standard at this time. But potential limits that have
11 been discussed are anywhere from one to 25 parts per
12 billion.

13 Because the county has had adequate water
14 production capacity to meet the demand without
15 monitoring well No. 1, it has not been utilized in the
16 water supply. However, it remains functional and
17 could be turned on anytime the needs justify.

18 The water from this well meets all federal
19 and state regulatory requirements. And it would be
20 inaccurate to say that this well has been closed
21 because of perchlorate contamination, implying that it
22 is permanently out of service.

23 Just in conclusion I would like to state that
24 the water supply in Los Alamos is exceptionally pure
25 and safe. And while there are certainly reasons for

1 vigilance on our part, there is no cause for panic,
2 fear mongering, or alarm.

3 At the Los Alamos County Department of Public
4 Utilities, we take our responsibility to protect the
5 drinking water supply of our residents with the utmost
6 seriousness. Thank you very much.

7 MS. HIBBS: I'm Linda Hibbs and I am a member
8 of People for Peace in its 18th year in Santa Fe.
9 There is a brute element in our circumstance, those of
10 us living together in this cobbled place called the
11 U.S.A., a loathsome beast. This loathsome beast is in
12 this room tonight. Please listen carefully,
13 especially those conducting the meeting.

14 The beast is none of you nor none of us in
15 the audience, though all of us have a choice in how to
16 respond to its pervasive controlling presence in our
17 lives. The loathsome beast, it represents the
18 systemic erosion of our power as a people despite the
19 good will to be citizens. Our ability to effect
20 change has been taken from us over matters of life and
21 death.

22 The beast is bureaucracy created since World
23 War II by Executive Order, the AEC, Atomic Energy
24 Commission, DOE, the Department of Energy, and NNSA,
25 the National Nuclear Security Administration, and

1 many, many more. And it is also -- well, after those
2 acronym bureaucracies we can't vote out, confined as
3 we are to comment periods like this one tonight.

4 And it is also the way the corporations were
5 made to be persons through legal chicanery at the end
6 of the 19th century. Except that unlike those of us
7 in the room tonight, corporations live on forever.
8 Corporations with their excessive powers have taken
9 over the mainframe of our government institutions, all
10 three branches, executive, legislative, and judicial.

11 I have spoken at countless DOE hearings over
12 the years going back to the early eighties about the
13 destructive program which is the work that goes on at
14 Los Alamos. I know that the hearings are a sham.

15 Just like dissent is scribed into sound
16 bites, if at all, our testimony is mocked tonight by
17 the three-minute limit and more importantly by a
18 process of decision-making where the beast makes the
19 frame around citizen input.

20 Only certain questions make it into the
21 analysis. Moral questions, no. Its true cost to a
22 country bankrupt both morally and economically by
23 preparations for war and by war, no. Even the name
24 complex transformation makes a mockery.

25 Transformation of what?

1 Is it our demise as a human species as we
2 exist more and more in planetary hospice. Today's
3 example, "Collapse of Salmon Stocks Endangers Pacific
4 Fishery" in today's New York Times. There is profound
5 dissidence in my womb as we continue to endow this
6 death camp, Los Alamos, for more than 60 years with no
7 end in sight.

8 I am tired of the gloss, the denial,
9 including my own denial of the reality of blowing up
10 bodies, penetrating their tissues with substances that
11 poison them, causing their death or lingering illness.
12 How does one comprehend this? One does not I've
13 decided unless, of course, you are a victim.

14 But take heart. The citizenry is becoming
15 aroused in a new way. We are beginning to step into
16 the awful gap in governance. Power will dwell in the
17 concrete lives of individuals who have begun to live
18 together in community at a local level to co-create a
19 waive like that is radically different from the agenda
20 here tonight.

21 I have new confidence in that vast and wily
22 power of individuals in community to apprehend and
23 assimilate the evil in our midst, Los Alamos, and to
24 turn government to right livelihood, caring for the
25 diverse, magnificent forms of life on earth. Thank

1 you.

2 MR. BROWN: Virginia Miller. Is Virginia
3 here? And Jan Lustig. Is Jan here?

4 MS. MILLER: Good evening. Thank you all for
5 hanging in there, it's been a long evening. Some of
6 it very inspiring and very challenging. My name is
7 Virginia Miller and I'm a resident of Santa Fe. I'm
8 also a member of the New Mexico Department of Peace
9 Initiative and People for Peace.

10 The proposed nuclear weapons and plutonium
11 pit production, complex 2030 at Los Alamos National
12 Lab, will generate huge amounts of additional
13 radioactive and chemical waste and will further
14 compromise the health and safety of New Mexicans and
15 the quality of our water, land, and air. You and I
16 both know this is true without an SPEIS which usually
17 states there is no significant impact anyway.

18 There is a significant impact. The future of
19 the New Mexico, our quality of life, our precious
20 water supply, and a sustainable peace economy are all
21 at stake. I am sharing my comments with our
22 Congressional and state leaders, calling on them to
23 use all the nonviolent power at their disposal to stop
24 complex 2030 and all nuclear weapons and pit
25 production at LANL and insist on active U.S.

1 leadership in working for worldwide nuclear
2 disarmament now which is mandated in the Nuclear
3 Nonproliferation Treaty and the United States
4 constitution.

5 The citizens of New Mexico get to decide. We
6 will let our Congressional delegation know what we
7 want and our state and local leaders and figure out
8 together how, not whether, how to accomplish our
9 goals.

10 We support our Santa Fe Mayor David Koss in
11 saying that nuclear weapons are not a part of our
12 future. We want our leaders to fund cleanup,
13 nonproliferation technology and practices, nuclear
14 disarmament verification technology and practices, and
15 safe and secure storage and monitoring for existing
16 nuclear materials and waste worldwide. And this is
17 the work the scientists at LANL and Sandia should be
18 doing.

19 I love this planet, I love this beautiful
20 state. There is no room for weapons of mass
21 destruction in our vision of our future. Let's create
22 good new jobs, developing sustainable renewable energy
23 on a small scale throughout our state. This does not
24 include nuclear energy. Let's choose life and prepare
25 for peace and nonviolence. It's entirely possible.

1 And I thank you all for helping it happen.

2 MR. BROWN: Jan Lustig. Audrey Storbech will
3 follow Jan.

4 MS. LUSTIG: My name is Jan Lustig, I'm a
5 resident of Santa Fe County. In Sunday's New Mexican
6 captioned Building the Lab's Future, Joe Martz stated
7 the objective, quote, is to have a lot fewer nuclear
8 weapons in the stockpile. The plan he continued is
9 not to make more nuclear weapons but to be able to
10 make more of them, if necessary.

11 I read this. And I thought I think I have to
12 read this again, because I couldn't quite get my head
13 around what he was saying. So I read it again. We
14 have to be capable of it he says. So this
15 570,000-square-foot building, a structure at the cost
16 of untold millions of dollars, is being created in
17 order to be capable of creating these pits.

18 We are capable of great things in this
19 country. We are capable of great science, great
20 futures of vision, we are capable of things that bring
21 us both constructive and destructive things. We are
22 capable of solving problems and of seeing a world in
23 dire need.

24 So why aren't we capable of having hearings
25 where our voices are heard and considered. Why are we

1 not capable of building a table to sit around. It
2 doesn't even have to be a table that fits a
3 570,000-square-foot building, but a table that can
4 seat people that are affecting our world, affecting
5 the policy in the world.

6 You know, I bet you could build a table of
7 gold and it would be less than a million dollars. You
8 could have the cushiest chairs to sit on and bring
9 George Bush and all the leaders of the world that have
10 issues with one another to talk to one another.

11 Why are we not capable of building bridges
12 over our differences? When we believe that producing
13 weapons of mass destruction will save us, we decide we
14 are not capable of making peace. We are capable of
15 great things and we are capable of making peace
16 without pits, without nuclear weapons, without
17 contaminating this earth.

18 Instead of being a steward of a WMD
19 stockpile, let us learn to be capable of being a
20 steward of this great world. The road to peace is not
21 paved with weapons of mass destruction. Thank you.

22 MR. BROWN: Nancy Kenney will follow Audrey.

23 MS. STORBECH: My name is Audrey Storbech and
24 I live in Santa Fe. The first statute that the
25 Congress passed when they came in, one statute was how

1 to swear the oath of office. The oath of office was
2 the most important thing. Article VI says if we make
3 a treaty, that we keep it.

4 The nonproliferation treaty should be kept.
5 Weapons of mass destruction are not cool and I am not
6 for them. I did happen to get a copy of a white paper
7 that Dr. Ron Brown had. He was a whistleblower from
8 Santa Fe, from Los Alamos.

9 And it was on the air, it was aired in every
10 area except here nationwide but blacked out for LANL.
11 And he was a quality control expert, quality
12 assurance. And he said that there are some real
13 serious problems at LANL. And they fired him.

14 He's a sweet man, a wave with a twinkle in
15 his eye, he's an awake being. We have technology
16 that's 100 years ahead of what we know and we could
17 clean this all up in no time. My father worked on the
18 missile base and he built those little silos, he was a
19 welder in North Dakota making the missiles.

20 But right now I actually believe based on
21 this guy who wrote this book with this woman from
22 Taos, her name is Nancy Redstar or something like
23 that, she cowrote with this Apache name Daniel Salter.

24 And Daniel Salter said that right now,
25 because the beings that are on the other side up there

1 would like to assist us and they can put out any nuke
2 that they want to and no nukes will occur. But that
3 doesn't mean our water can't be contaminated here just
4 like Rocky Flats. It can. It can.

5 But he did say that. He's an ACIO. Most of
6 you haven't heard of those letters and you probably
7 won't. But I found his book in the ark. And Daniel
8 Salter is 38th level above the President. And he said
9 that.

10 He also printed the anti Star Wars defense
11 initiative bill that Representative Kucinich wrote
12 that had the word chem trails in it in the middle of
13 his book. And I happened to speak to three
14 Congressmen about the chem trails, Kucinich, Kerry,
15 and Udall.

16 And Kerry tried to say it didn't exist. But
17 then I told him that, well, you know, Kucinich spoke
18 to 5,000 of us and said that they did, that
19 contaminates the air. But it's the water that we're
20 concerned about and the air about Rocky Flats because
21 we do not want the contamination.

22 But all of that is true. But they can't talk
23 about those things, they can't talk about the chem
24 trails. They can't honestly do that because we don't
25 really protect our congressmen enough, we don't give

1 them Secret Service.

2 And if they just happen to do a little
3 Spitzer ordeal, they're spit out. And do they have
4 pictures of those that did that? Yeah, you betcha,
5 baby. They're all frightened. They're frightened to
6 be real.

7 Basically I'll just say that we should be
8 going by our Bill of Rights. Citizens' rights are
9 everything. Corporations are not people. The 13th
10 amendment says we shouldn't even have any people that
11 have titles of nobility. But that is not the
12 constitution we're going by, we're going by the
13 corporations' constitution. They just vote out No.13
14 and just start it over.

15 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much. After Nancy
16 Elise Gent is next.

17 MS. KENNEY: Hello. My name is Nancy Kenney.
18 I'm a native Santa Fean, my family is an eighth
19 generation family also. I have family -- my great
20 uncle was the last territorial governor and the first
21 governor of the state.

22 And I'm telling you these things because I
23 want you to understand that the handing down of oral
24 traditions and the handing down of moral traditions
25 were I believe part of what my family was all about.

1 My two great uncles and my great aunt wrote the
2 Constitution of New Mexico. They tried to create
3 values that would guide us in these times.

4 And I have sisters who are Ph.D.s and doctors
5 who are very smart or intelligent. I have a
6 science -- a very strong science family. My strength
7 is as a teacher and as a musician and as a filmmaker.
8 I guess you could call me the artistic branch of the
9 family.

10 So with that I will say. (singing) I have
11 dreamed on this mountain since first I was my mother's
12 daughter. And you can't just take my dreams away, not
13 with me watching. You may drive a big machine, but I
14 was born a strong wise woman. And you can't just take
15 my dreams away.

16 It's the mountain raised our many daughters.
17 Some died young but some still live. And if you come
18 here to nuke my mountain, well, we ain't come here to
19 give it. I have dreamed on this mountain since first
20 I was my mother's daughter. And please, please don't
21 take my, take my dreams away, not with me watching.
22 Please don't take my, take my dreams of peace away.
23 Thank you.

24 MR. BROWN: The next name I have is Elise
25 Gent. Is Elise here? Lola Moonfrey.

1 MS. MOONFREY: That's a hard act to follow.
2 My name is Lola Moonfrey, I've been a resident of New
3 Mexico since 1970, a resident of Santa Fe since 1981.

4 I'm very grateful for the people who have
5 spoken with humor, the people who have reminded us
6 that we are connected, that we are relatives. When
7 you understand that you're connected with people, you
8 really do understand that we are capable of creating
9 peace and nonviolence.

10 I oppose the entire nuclear thing, the
11 nuclear weapons thing. I would like to see our money
12 spent on extensive healing, on sustainable resource
13 development. I would like to see us travel to other
14 countries more. I would like to see our youth travel
15 to other countries more.

16 I would like our money spent on communication
17 skills, on conflict resolutions, on understanding how
18 to talk to people who are different, who are, quote,
19 different, how to speak with different cultures and
20 different upbringings and different places in the
21 world.

22 I would like us to be learning how to speak
23 with people who are full of hatred, who seem rabidly
24 uninterested in being able to talk, because it is
25 possible. I've seen it.

1 The people who say that there is low cancer
2 rates in Los Alamos, maybe you all have special
3 techniques that you line your wells with. I don't
4 know. But those of us who are downstream of Los
5 Alamos, there are high cancer rates.

6 I know too many people who have died. And
7 I'm not just talking breast cancer, brain cancer,
8 liver cancer, kidney cancer, thyroid cancer. You
9 know, it exists. You can't tell me this is safe.
10 We've seen Chernobyl, we've seen all of the places
11 where it's not safe.

12 And we have veterans who return from the Gulf
13 War, from Iraq, who are full of cancer problems, who
14 have kids with birth defects. And what about where
15 the uranium is mined from. This doesn't get talked
16 about. This is examples of environmental racism.

17 This is our Denai people, this is our Hopi
18 people, this is our Lakota people, and the Oglala
19 people up in South Dakota. These are our native
20 people who are getting wasted by uranium. They have
21 birth defects that are much worse than having one ear.
22 This is environmental racism, this is ongoing
23 genocide. How in the world is this acceptable?

24 We need to have the large perspective of
25 eagle to see the whole picture. And I would like to

1 ask please that we remember that we are connected.
2 That maybe there are other ways, that maybe we don't
3 have to have weapons or capability to have weapons in
4 order to create the security that seems to be
5 requested. Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: John Gonzales. John will be
7 followed by Richard Johnson. Is Richard here? Okay.

8 MR. GONZALES: My name is John Gonzales, I'm
9 a resident of La Cienega, New Mexico, and I have been
10 for all of my 23 years. Seeing so many Los Alamos
11 scientists in our midst, I would urge them to
12 challenge themselves to an even greater reduction in
13 nuclear weapons and to hold themselves to an even
14 greater environmental standard.

15 The preferred alternative should be the
16 elimination of the nuclear weapons program. Still any
17 reduction is a step in the right direction. But now
18 we have a call for 80 new nuclear triggers. And these
19 are not for the Cold War era nuclear deterrent, these
20 are 80 small triggers for tactical nukes, for
21 practical nukes.

22 This is not so much of a deterrent as it is a
23 provocation. We must all oppose the idea of nuclear
24 weapons, and I admire those who came up and spoke so
25 adamantly against them, so that they may never be

1 used. Make the choice to resist proliferation, it is
2 to this that we are ethically obliged.

3 MR. BROWN: Richard Johnson. Jeanne Wheeler
4 is after Richard.

5 MR. JOHNSON: I'm a businessman in Santa Fe.
6 And I'm sitting here trying to understand the
7 rationale of the NNSA and the supporting arguments of
8 LANL employees and trying to put this into a business
9 perspective.

10 So I was trying to imagine if I was the
11 business owner and I had a fleet of 20,000 buses. And
12 I never used those buses. In fact, I even had them
13 hidden in garages underground. But I wanted to
14 maintain those buses so that another bus company
15 wouldn't open and compete with me.

16 And those buses had engines that would last
17 100 years. And my oldest bus was 35 years old. So I
18 would go to the bank -- I already borrowed money to
19 buy these buses. But I would go to the bank and I
20 would tell the banker that I need to put new engines
21 in my buses and could he loan me the money to buy new
22 engines, because I needed new spare parts, because I
23 wasn't sure that if I had to take those buses out of
24 the ground that they would run properly, even though
25 the engines were guaranteed to last 100 years. I

1 think my banker would have me committed. I really do.

2 I mean this is like such tortured logic. I'm
3 sorry. I just really don't understand. But as I
4 understand this expanded pit manufacturing at LANL is
5 being justified by three different reasons. One, that
6 we need to produce spare parts for maintaining our
7 existing stockpile; and two, to produce new RW
8 warheads or a new generation of buses.

9 The number of any -- the number, if any, of
10 W88 and new RW warheads considered necessary wouldn't
11 be known until a bipartisan nuclear policy study
12 required by Congress is completed and our new
13 President puts forth his new nuclear policy
14 initiative. So to go ahead with this plan at this
15 time seems just ludicrous.

16 The other argument I'm hearing is that it's
17 good economic development. Now, when does national
18 security have anything to do with economic
19 development? I mean that just seems crazy to me. I
20 mean it's like saying the Mafia or organized crime is
21 good for the community because it promotes economic
22 development in the community; and, therefore, we
23 should keep organized crime in the community. I mean
24 those two things just don't go together at all.

25 Our country needs to make a commitment to

1 nuclear nonproliferation backed by a concrete
2 examples. Pit production at Los Alamos and Lawrence
3 Livermore is projected to cost \$1.6 billion. And this
4 is at a time of soaring budget deficits and
5 deteriorating infrastructure in our country.

6 It just seems crazy. In addition, last
7 year's landmark study concluded that plutonium pits
8 have reliable lifetimes of 85 to 100 years.

9 MR. BROWN: Can you give us just one
10 concluding statement because you're over the time
11 limit.

12 MR. JOHNSON: Well, that pit lifetime study
13 alone should -- anybody with any common sense would
14 realize we don't need new pits. I mean if they're
15 going to last 100 years, why are we building them 60
16 years before we need them?

17 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thanks very much. Jeanne
18 Wheeler.

19 MS. WHEELER: Hi. I just wanted to say thank
20 you for this hearing and to all those who have gone
21 before me who have expressed many of my thoughts and
22 feelings. Do two or more wrongs make a right? I wish
23 to address my comments mainly to the promoters,
24 perpetrators, and producers of nuclear weapons at LANL
25 and elsewhere.

1 Please search deeply within yourselves for
2 the creative intelligence you need to look beyond the
3 belief that nuclear weapons can in any way ensure
4 security on the planet. I am sure that you can and
5 will see more clearly if you truly desire.

6 And please realize that working instead for
7 nonproliferation, total disarmament, and complete
8 cleanup is what is really most essential for the
9 health and well-being for all life here. Please honor
10 the true light of your soul. Thank you.

11 MR. BROWN: Dorothy, you have five sentences?
12 Just very quickly, please. Go ahead.

13 MS. KEIGHTLEY: I'm Dorothy Keightly, I live
14 an hour east of here. On the way over incidentally, I
15 passed three trucks, unidentified. I was told years
16 ago these are carrying nuclear or environmental
17 disastrous waste. I just want you to know that that's
18 been happening for quite a long time before we even
19 knew about it.

20 I have a couple of remarks to the gentleman
21 from Los Alamos. I didn't expect to speak and this is
22 not a speech. One, so far as cleaning up the mess
23 you've made, why make it? You are creating a hazard
24 and then you are bragging about cleaning it up. This
25 is costing money and it's a futile exercise.

1 The other futility is that we have created
2 the threat that you -- I feel as if I'm listening to a
3 broken record. You each talk about security and the
4 threats. We have created the threats all over the
5 world.

6 And someone said wars are political. Wars
7 are not political. Wars are economic. We are
8 stealing the resources from the rest of the world to
9 keep ourselves fat. And you are contributing to it.
10 And besides that, we can never set off a nuclear bomb.
11 So that your activities are utterly futile.

12 And I do have one -- my son -- I know Los
13 Alamos. I have been here for almost 40 years. My
14 son -- one of my sons did his dissertation in Los
15 Alamos. So I'm familiar with the area.

16 You did something that you may not know, but
17 you have inherited the arrogance of the original men
18 there in Los Alamos. They set off a cloud, a
19 radioactive cloud to see how far it would go before it
20 disintegrated. It went as far as Watrous and Wagon
21 Mound.

22 All you have to do is go to Meadows Home in
23 Las Vegas and see the basket cases there and find out
24 when those people were born. I suspect you'll find a
25 cluster of those people there.

1 That's arrogance that you gentlemen with your
2 coats and ties are suggesting that we continue. And
3 the only thing is I think I did say wars -- all right.
4 I'm finished. You are working at a futile job, those
5 bombs can never be set off. Face it.

6 MR. BROWN: That concludes our speakers. And
7 it concludes the hearing. Thanks very much for being
8 in attendance. And I think we owe a round of applause
9 to our court reporter. Thank you.

10 (At 11:30 p.m. the hearing adjourned.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2
3 I, JAN A. WILLIAMS, New Mexico CCR #14, DO
4 HEREBY CERTIFY that on March 13, 2008, the proceedings
5 in the above captioned matter were taken before me,
6 that I did report in stenographic shorthand the
7 proceedings set forth herein, and the foregoing pages
8 are a true and correct transcription to the best of my
9 ability.

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

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 JAN A. WILLIAMS, RPR

New Mexico CCR #14

24 License Expires: 12/31/08

25 (6045A) JAW