

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION
SUPPLEMENTARY PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

---oOo---

PUBLIC HEARING

March 19, 2008

AFTERNOON PROCEEDINGS

Location: ROBERT LIVERMORE COMMUNITY CENTER
4444 East Avenue
Livermore, California

Reported by: DENNIS M. SOUZA, CSR #3893

DAILY COPY DEPOSITIONS

1852 WEST ELEVENTH STREET, SUITE 339

TRACY, CALIFORNIA 95376

(209) 832-1804

1 Tracy, California

March 19, 2008

2

PROCEEDINGS

3

MR. LAWSON: Good afternoon, and thank

4

you all for taking the time to participate in this

5

important public hearing on the National Nuclear

6

Security Administration Supplementary Programmatic

7

Environmental Impact Statement or Supplemental

8

PEIS.

9

That is for the Transformation of the

10

Nations Nuclear Weapons Complex. I hope you have

11

had an adequate opportunity to browse the displays

12

at the back of the room and talk to the project

13

staff just during the completed open house. If

14

not, there will probably be other opportunities for

15

you during the day and evening if you will be

16

around.

17

My name is Barry Lawson and I am the

18

moderator for this hearing. My role this afternoon

19

is basically to ensure that you all have an

20

opportunity to obtain information about the

21

proposed program and to provide comments to the

22

administration and also that everyone observes a

23

few basic ground rules which are intended to

24

provide for a fair and respectful participation by

25

all.

1 As you signed in at the registration
2 table you should have received a participants
3 packet which contains information on the
4 Transformation of the Nuclear Weapons Complex.

5 There are two parts to this hearing.
6 The informal segment began with the open house and
7 continues after my remarks with a brief welcome
8 video by Mr. Robert Smolen who is the deputy
9 administrator for defense programs; then a
10 20-minute presentation by Ted Wyka, the
11 Supplemental PEIS document manager.

12 Mr. Wyka will discuss The Complex
13 Transformation Project and the contents of the
14 supplemental PEIS. The formal segment of this
15 afternoon's hearings will begin following
16 Mr. Wyka's presentation. During the formal segment
17 members of the public, that would be you, will be
18 called to make oral comments on the supplemental
19 PEIS. The Court Reporter will then begin making a
20 verbatim record of your comments.

21 There will be no exchange of questions
22 and answers and NNSA officials are here to listen
23 to your comments but will not be engaging in
24 dialogue.

25 Now if you wish to make an oral comment

1 during the formal oral comment segment you will
2 need to have signed up at the registration table at
3 the entrance to this room. I will be recognizing
4 speakers as their names appear on the registration
5 list that will be provided to me when we begin that
6 segment.

7 The ground rules for the speakers
8 provide additional information on giving your oral
9 comments.

10 In the formal session, members of the
11 public will be allotted up to three minutes each to
12 make their comments. We now have enough speakers
13 to go beyond the 3:00 o'clock hour if we stick to
14 the three minutes, so I will give you a warning
15 before that time.

16 Obviously, I urge you to make your oral
17 comments concise and to the point of the content of
18 the PEIS. Now, if you have a written statement,
19 particularly one that is particularly longer than
20 your oral comment period allows, please summarize
21 those comments and submit the written document in
22 its entirety. If you believe that you will need
23 more than the allotted time, let me know, and if
24 time remains before the end of the afternoon
25 session, I will be pleased to provide you

1 additional time after everyone else has had his or
2 her first opportunity to comment in this formal
3 segment. I urge you to keep your comments concise
4 and I do need to keep you to no more than three
5 minutes.

6 That is it for the agenda and the
7 hearing format. Are there any questions?

8 Okay. Thank you. And thank you for
9 your cooperation in making this a productive and
10 respectful hearing and I look forward to your
11 participation. Now for the eight minute video to
12 be followed directly by Mr. Wyka's presentation
13 then we will begin the formal testimony prior to
14 the hearing. Thank you.

15 Whereupon the formal video and speaking
16 presentation was given.

17 MR. LAWSON: Hopefully we can get this
18 fixed soon. Thank you very much, Mr. Wyka, and let
19 me just read a couple of paragraphs into the
20 official record.

21 This portion of our hearing is
22 officially designated as the afternoon portion of
23 the Livermore California public hearing for the
24 National Nuclear Security Administration's
25 supplemental PEIS of the complex transformation

1 program.

2 This hearing is being held on March 19
3 in the Robert Livermore Community Center. It is
4 being held to receive comments on the content of
5 this supplemental PEIS. We are commencing the
6 public comment portion of this hearing at roughly
7 12:45 p.m. and as scheduled to adjourn once all
8 participants have had their opportunity to make
9 comments or at 3:00 o'clock. Each speaker will
10 have a maximum of three minutes. We will begin
11 with a mixture of elected State and local
12 officials.

13 This hearing was preceded by a
14 presentation by NNSA PEIS document manager Mr. Ted
15 Wyka. Mr. Wyka will represent the NNSA here in
16 listening to and accepting your comments.

17 For the record my name is Barry Lawson
18 and I have been asked by NNSA to conduct this
19 comment period as an independent and neutral
20 moderator. I will insure the ground rules reviewed
21 earlier in the meeting will be followed.

22 The Court Reporter this afternoon is
23 Dennis Souza. His task is to create a complete and
24 accurate transcription of this hearing. The
25 verbatim transcript of all oral comments received

1 today will be included in NNSA's record of these
2 proceedings and the administration will place
3 copies of the transcript from this and other public
4 hearings in its Freedom of Information Act
5 designated reading rooms as soon as practical.

6 If you wish to make comments today, you
7 must have first signed up at the registration
8 table. I will recognize speakers in the order in
9 which they are registered allowing elected and
10 Federal and State officials, if any, to go first.

11 Now I'd ask you to please remain in the
12 room if you are scheduled to speak. I will be
13 calling three speakers at a time, the current and
14 the next two, so that you will have some warning
15 before you are to speak. I would ask you when you
16 hear your name, to please move forward to the front
17 of the room, if you could, so that when you are
18 called to be on deck, so it will give you that much
19 more time for testimony. There are a couple of
20 seats on this side and there are three or four
21 seats over there that you could come to.

22 When I say that it is your turn, I would
23 ask you to come to this podium to my left and to
24 your right.

25 Now, being the technological age that it

1 is, we have cords all over the place. We have
2 tried to cover up as many of them as possible with
3 rugs so that I will just warn you to be very
4 careful both of the cords, but more importantly the
5 rugs because they are there and people can trip on
6 rugs as well as they can trip on cords. So be very
7 careful as you come up.

8 If you are approaching the time allowed,
9 that is the three minutes, I will give you a signal
10 orally, something like saying you have 30 minutes
11 to complete your comments -- asking you to -- 30
12 seconds. Did I say 30 minutes. That is for me.
13 The rest of you only get 30 seconds. If you are
14 approaching that time limit I will give you that is
15 a go and ask you to summarize your comments as
16 quickly and as gracefully as possible.

17 I may call a break or recess to the
18 proceedings to give all of us and particularly the
19 Court Reporter a breather if it is necessary.
20 Also, I would ask you to please conduct any
21 conversations you need to have outside this room
22 and take a moment to shut off cell phones if you
23 have them on.

24 Commenters are recommended to state
25 their name for the Court Reporter's record and if

1 you have a written copy of your comments or if you
2 have a written document that you would like to
3 submit, please bring it to me after you have
4 spoken. Written materials will be formally
5 accepted into the record as exhibits to this
6 hearing in addition to the oral comments.

7 Very importantly, each type of comment,
8 whether they are written or oral, receive equal
9 treatment by NNSA. Remember once again, you may
10 also submit your comments, additional comments by
11 April 10 and there is no limitation on the number
12 or the length of comments an individual may submit.
13 Okay. Thank you for your endurance here.

14 The first speaker will be George Miller,
15 and Mr. Miller will be followed by Jeff Williams
16 and Robert Sakai.

17 MR. MILLER: Good afternoon. I am
18 George Miller, Director of Lawrence Livermore
19 National Laboratory and President of Lawrence
20 Livermore National Security. I am here today to
21 comment on the preferred alternative that NNSA has
22 described for you. It's been clear for some time
23 that the nation has needed a blueprint for the
24 future of our Nuclear Weapons Complex. It takes
25 into account the circumstances that have changed

1 since the end of the cold war.

2 This preferred alternative takes into
3 account those changes and makes important steps
4 towards a smaller more efficient complex that can
5 effectively support and sustain a smaller stockpile
6 while being good stewards of the environment.

7 I am pleased that Lawrence Livermore has
8 been named as a center of excellence for nuclear
9 design and engineering, for super computing and for
10 high explosives research. I am especially pleased
11 that NNSA will continue its investment in high
12 energy density physics with the National Ignition
13 Facility as a science magnet. These selections
14 recognize and build upon the unique laboratory
15 expertise and nuclear design in engineering, in
16 high explosive science, in high energy density
17 physics and high performance computing and
18 simulation. These represent continuing the path
19 forward that is allowing us to maintain our
20 stockpile without nuclear testing.

21 The transformational change is cited in
22 the preferred alternative are important. Preferred
23 alternative addresses the need to consolidate
24 within the complex at fewer sites to replace
25 outdated facilities that are more cost effective

1 and more environmentally responsible. We strongly
2 support your desire to remove category one and
3 category two, special nuclear materials from our
4 laboratory by the year 2012. In fact, two such
5 shipments have already been completed. We will of
6 course continue to maintain the highest level of
7 safety and security on site during this transition
8 and we will work closely with NNSA to ship this
9 material properly as quickly as is practicable.

10 As you have cited, Livermore plays an
11 important continuing role for our nation in
12 insuring safety, security and reliability of the
13 nations nuclear deterrent without nuclear testing.
14 We look forward to continuing that mission and
15 appreciate NNSA's support in the broader context of
16 helping to ensure global stability for the
17 application of the laboratory's multidisciplinary
18 science and technology to improve security, to meet
19 energy and environmental needs and to strengthen US
20 economic competitiveness.

21 MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds please.

22 MR. MILLER: We will do this by building
23 on our core scientific and technical competencies
24 such as the center of excellence that had been
25 named in a preferred alternative and by developing

1 new capabilities, particularly in the areas of
2 national security, photon science simulations,
3 system engineering and micro and nanos science,
4 engineering and advanced technology, energy and
5 environmental sciences. Thank you for this
6 opportunity to comment today and thank you for
7 acknowledging the special and significant role of
8 Lawrence Livermore National Lab has in support of
9 the nation.

10 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Thank you.
11 The next speaker is Jeff Williams to be followed by
12 Robert Sakai and Paul Homert.

13 MR. WILLIAMS: My name is Jeff Williams.
14 I am a member of the Livermore City Council and
15 also a recently retired 35 year employee of
16 Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. The
17 Livermore City Council has neither debated nor
18 voted on this PEIS or any of the details in it so I
19 am strictly speaking as a single member of the city
20 council and do not represent this as a decision of
21 the entire council.

22 LLNL and Sandia California have been
23 highly influential in the growth of Livermore as a
24 city. Significant reductions in employment at
25 these labs is now having and will continue to have

1 substantial negative impacts on the City of
2 Livermore and on neighboring cities whose residents
3 are employees of the labs.

4 Cities fund their services as police and
5 fire protection, schools, roads and sewers and
6 other services principally from property tax and
7 sales tax revenues. LLNL and Sandia do not pay
8 property taxes or generate significant sales tax
9 revenues locally. The primary contribution is
10 employee salaries spent in Livermore and
11 investments they make in their homes.

12 Employees participation in city
13 government, local schools and nonprofit
14 organizations is also very important to the
15 development, management and culture of Livermore as
16 a city. Seven past mayors of Livermore were either
17 LLNL or Sandia employees. Seven current local
18 officials in Tracy, Dublin, San Ramon and Livermore
19 are either LLNL employees or retirees.

20 I support NNSA's preferred alternative
21 with some concerns that I would like to mention.
22 Designation of LLNL as a center of excellence
23 sounds good for LLNL's future, but only if this
24 designation is supported by sustained steady and
25 long-term funding, otherwise it is just a shiny

1 ornament without substance.

2 LLNL and other NASA -- and other NNSA
3 labs have succeeded because of the quality and
4 dedication of their employees, not because of the
5 brilliance of Washington, D.C. oversight.

6 Quality and dedicated employees are
7 attracted by offering work to the employees, that
8 is a work of lifetime's dedication, a lifetimes
9 career dedication and commitment. World class
10 expertise does not grow from and cannot be
11 maintained by short term or cyclic employment. The
12 PEIS view graphs that were displayed here do not
13 address the economic impact of the transformation,
14 although it may, in fact, be addressed in the
15 longer version that I haven't seen. Things that
16 NNSA can do to mitigate losses due to the
17 transformation for the cities that are home for
18 LLNL and Sandia employees are one: Invest in the
19 city infrastructure that supports the labs and
20 their employees more than just funding specialized
21 school programs and making contributions to local
22 charities and nonprofits. Encourage and facilitate
23 local start-up companies using lab technologies to
24 compensate for loss of jobs. Facilitate labs
25 acquisition in non-NNSA work to mitigate reductions

1 in NNSA funded work and finally make more
2 procurements locally so cities can benefits from
3 sales tax revenue and employment of local supplies.

4 Again I support NNSA preferred
5 alternative with the following comment: Do not
6 rush to transfer special nuclear materials from
7 Livermore to other sites, handling and
8 transportation of nuclear materials is where the
9 safety and security risks are the greatest. Take
10 as much time as needed to do this right. Thank
11 you.

12 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. The next
13 speaker is Robert Sakai to be followed by
14 Paul Homert and Marj Leider.

15 MR. SAKAI: My name is Bob Sakai and I
16 am technology and trade director for the East Bay
17 Economic Development Alliance and I am going to
18 read a letter from the Chair of the EEA supervisor
19 Keith Carson. The East Bay EDA wishes to express
20 our appreciation for the many contributions
21 Lawrence Livermore and Sandia National Laboratories
22 have made to our region and to comment on the Bay
23 Area unique assets that can compliment laboratory
24 technology as DOE plans to transform our national
25 weapons complex.

1 East Bay EDA's membership of over 600
2 public, private, community leaders in Alameda and
3 Contra Costa counties are aware of the important
4 economic impact that both national laboratories
5 have on our region.

6 Laboratory technologies have been
7 responsible for many significant improvements in
8 the areas of health care, infrastructure
9 maintenance, energy, public protection, emergency
10 response and our understanding of climate, not to
11 mention advances in basic science.

12 During 2007, the technology and
13 capabilities of the national laboratories in
14 Livermore and Berkeley played a major role in
15 attracting 920 million dollars in public and
16 private sector funding for biofuels research in the
17 East Bay.

18 Thanks to the Department of Energy's
19 funding for the Joint BioEnergy Institute and the
20 expertise of our national laboratories, the East
21 Bay has become a global leader in biofuels
22 research.

23 The two independent decisions DOE's
24 public sector award of Jay Bay (phonetic) as a
25 result of a national competition and BP's private

1 sector award of The Energy BioSciences Institute as
2 a result of a international competition, these two
3 decisions also highlight the fact that the Bay Area
4 has something to offer in meeting national R&D
5 priorities.

6 For instance, the Bay Area is a leader
7 in not just one but a number of technologies, this
8 spread of expertise has enabled technology-fusion
9 across disciplines and industries leading to
10 numerous breakthrough innovations.

11 To be effective of the new technology in
12 the areas of national security and energy
13 independence require not only innovation but also
14 rapid commercialization and deployment. The Bay
15 Area has no pier in taking technology to market and
16 the regions abundant laboratory university private
17 sector technology, financial resources,
18 entrepreneur networks and skilled workforce can be
19 seen as national assets in their own right compared
20 to the national laboratories themselves, therefore,
21 the East Bay, EDA supports restructuring and
22 modernizing Lawrence Livermore and Sandia National
23 Laboratories as outlined in the preferred
24 alternative.

25 We also consider the East Bay to be the

1 preferred location for attaining the objectives of
2 the complex transformation. The proposed
3 transformation of these East Bay laboratories
4 represent a unique opportunity to build on the
5 public private collaboration occurring in the Bay
6 Area and to advance research in areas key to our
7 global competitiveness and national security.

8 The region has benefitted from the work
9 of these institutions and the contributions of its
10 employees over the past 60 years and we look
11 forward to working closely with these laboratories
12 in the future to maximize the opportunities
13 presented by DOE's complex transformation.

14 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next
15 speaker is Paul Homert to be followed by Marj
16 Leider and Leah Abraham.

17 MR. HOMERT: My name is Paul Homert and
18 I serve as Vice President and site manager of
19 Sandia National Laboratories California site here
20 in Livermore. In the development of the draft
21 complex transformation, SPEIS, Sandia contributes
22 to it's content and we support both the analysis
23 within it and especially the directions set by the
24 preferred alternative outlined in section S3.17 of
25 the SPEIS. I would like to publically offer my

1 thanks to the federal leadership and NNSA for this
2 monumental effort and point specifically to
3 Dr. George Allen for his personal and profession
4 commitment to this accomplishment.

5 At the March 11th public meeting in
6 Albuquerque Sandia's director for nuclear weapons,
7 Joan Woodard, offered remarks in support of the
8 NNSA complex transformation proposal. Indeed we at
9 Sandia recognize the likelihood of changes at the
10 national level in the nuclear weapons program. We
11 join with other sites within the complex within
12 NNSA and our dedication to continue stewardship of
13 the nuclear deterrent and efficient use of our
14 facilities seeking consolidations where
15 appropriate. Here in Livermore we are committed to
16 working with the DOE and NNSA for new stewardship
17 and sponsorship models for Sandia California
18 facilities to enable the essential capabilities for
19 weapon system engineering while facilitating
20 broader application of the capabilities to
21 important national security issues. This is in
22 keeping with and further strengthens our
23 traditional partnership with the
24 Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory for national
25 security. We also see the positives in identifying

1 other critical functions within the Nuclear Weapons
2 Complex and the designation of centers of
3 excellence to focus on each of these critical
4 functions. This explicit identification and
5 designation offers the opportunity to eliminate
6 unneeded redundancy and therefore expense in
7 exercising stewardship over the nations nuclear
8 deterrent. In this capacity Sandia's committed to
9 leading science and engineering for non-nuclear
10 component and to the further consolidation of
11 non-nuclear component design agency
12 responsibilities as called for in the draft
13 preferred alternative.

14 We also acknowledge that you need to
15 properly size the nuclear weapons program work
16 force. NNSA has set a goal of reducing the size of
17 Nuclear Weapons Complex work force by somewhere
18 between 20 and 30 percent over the course of the
19 next ten years. We at Sandia have sought to do our
20 part in pursuit of a leaner Nuclear Weapons Complex
21 by carefully and responsibly managing our workforce
22 size, reducing the size of our nuclear weapons
23 oriented workforce by over 15 percent from October
24 2003 to the present by directing these scientist
25 the and engineers to other national work.

1 We are also deliberate about sustaining
2 critical skills inherent in our work force through
3 strategic hiring and mentoring of top graduates
4 especially from key universities throughout the
5 country and through organized knowledge
6 preservation programs at Sandia we ensure that the
7 work force of tomorrow will have the access to
8 technical knowledge and lessons learned that will
9 be needed to face the challenges of nuclear
10 deterrent and our nations security in the future.
11 Thank you very much for your time today.

12 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Next speaker is
13 Marj Leider to be followed by Leah Abraham and
14 Eleanor Foster.

15 MS. LEIDER: Good afternoon. I am
16 Marj Leider. I am member of your city council. I
17 moved to Livermore many, many years ago to go to
18 work and my husband and I to work in the
19 Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, I was a
20 radio chemist for quite sometime and I wanted to
21 say one of the things that we who work there in
22 times of cold war, obviously that was when I was
23 there, really believed in what we were doing and we
24 really felt we were doing it for our country and I
25 think that is something that people really need to

1 know. I welcome the plans for their consolidation.
2 I think they would be very wise in our economic
3 times. Big corporations always have to look at the
4 financial side and as a city council person, I
5 would like to see an echo of what Mr. Williams
6 said, that the laboratories do realize that they
7 can contribute to the city more as far as our
8 schools and our recreation and our city
9 infrastructure is concerned. When my children went
10 to school the laboratory did have us fill out a
11 form that we worked at the lab and they did give
12 more money to the schools because of that and so I
13 would hope that in the future when this change
14 comes about, that they do think about this kind of
15 thing.

16 I know a lot of our citizens should be
17 very happy about the removal of the plutonium, we
18 hear that as counsel people for many years and I
19 think it is very wise. The city has grown to it is
20 surrounding the laboratory. It is not just 8,000
21 people over on this side of town like it was when I
22 first moved here. I welcome their activities,
23 their consolidation and I thank them very much for
24 having these open public hearings where everyone
25 gets a chance to speak and to learn about it. I

1 think their outreach and education has been
2 excellent, so thank you very much.

3 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Ma'am. The next
4 speak Leah Abraham and Ms. Abraham will be followed
5 by Eleanor Foster and Maria Cecilia Freeman.

6 MS. ABRAHAM: Hi, my name Leah Abraham
7 and I work for Peace Action West, an organization
8 that for 50 years has been working to eliminate the
9 spurge of nuclear weapons.

10 I want to address what complex
11 transformation really is. The DOE will say that
12 this program will provide a safe, secure and
13 reliable deterrent. Nothing could be farther from
14 the truth. No nuclear weapon is safe. It is by
15 design and intent unsafe. Ronald Regan for all his
16 faults, said that nuclear weapons, all of them, are
17 totally irrational, totally inhumane, good for
18 nothing but killing, possibly destructive of life
19 on earth and civilization. Rather than a deterrent
20 this is a provocative statement by our
21 administration. It will engender distrust with our
22 allies and provoke our enemies to take similar
23 actions. We live in an increasingly precarious
24 world and to add to that environment by developing
25 a new generation of nuclear weapons is asinine.

1 No longer can our nuclear policy be
2 guided by the principal: Do as I say, not as I do.
3 We can only restore America's moral authority by
4 abiding by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty,
5 something that our constitution forces us to abide
6 by in practicing what we preach, ending our plans
7 to produce new nuclear weapons.

8 Those are from my prepared comments. As
9 a side note, I have noticed that the folks that
10 came before me keep on talking about the economic
11 benefits of this program to their city. While I
12 understand that times are tough and building --
13 bringing weapons here will only help in some ways,
14 the people that live here -- I have noticed they
15 avoided using the words nuclear weapons, and that's
16 what they are, and they are meant to destroy and
17 perhaps if this country had ever experienced being
18 the victim of these weapons, we wouldn't be so
19 cavalier in wanting to develop a whole new
20 generation. In fact, you know, hundreds of
21 thousands of people have died by these weapons by
22 the hands of this government and we can't keep on
23 thinking about it and what benefits us, what helps
24 our paycheck and what develops our community.
25 These are weapons that will be used against others

1 and it is morally unthinkable that we are even
2 considering this, considering our past. Thank you,
3 have a good day.

4 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next
5 speaker is Eleanor Foster to be followed by Maria
6 Cecilia Freeman and Sandee Wiedemann.

7 MS. FOSTER: Thank you all. It is very
8 difficult to communicate in these hearings. It
9 feels as if there are walls of power, almost of
10 steel between us who are trying to speak --

11 MR. LAWSON: Is it possible we can turn
12 up the microphone a bit.

13 MS. FOSTER: I will try to speak louder.
14 Walls of power between us and those who are
15 presenting NNSA are the officials. But you call
16 these hearings and that must mean listening, so I
17 thank you very much that you are listening for what
18 we have to say is very important to us and to our
19 country and to the whole world.

20 One word we have heard a lot today is
21 security, and wishfully, we suppose that would
22 include the word hope but we too find that this
23 hope is terribly bound up in a tight wad of
24 desperation. In your security, we see a picture of
25 mighty preparation for a world of devastation.

1 We have tried to offer reassurance,
2 reassurance that you trust. What we really need to
3 protect us is more, make swifter more updated
4 nuclear weapons, perhaps even reaching into space
5 and that will make a better cover. I believe you
6 used the word "umbrella" for the conventional arms
7 which should also be updated, but we are not
8 reassured knowing that even with the present
9 arsenal has now about 10,000 intact reliable
10 warheads on hand, but only 20 of those warheads
11 could kill 20 million people -- our brothers and
12 sisters, 20 million people.

13 I spoke to you of the words reality,
14 that we tried to find some of the words that are
15 different that you would use to (inaudible) I want
16 to speak to you about a kind of reality that we
17 have explored and reality of some of acquaintances.

18 I can do this most easily by telling you
19 a story from 50 years ago.

20 In 1951, a physical anthropologist named
21 Earle Reynolds was hired by the National Academy of
22 Sciences to make a study of the biological and
23 genetic effects of radiation on the children of
24 Hiroshima and Nagasaki who had been exposed to
25 radiation from the atomic bomb.

1 In Hiroshima, Earle Reynolds was
2 sickened when he was immersed in the actual lives
3 of the families and children and he moved from this
4 theoretical understanding of the effects of
5 ionization, to then the following scientific
6 laboratories but from that he began to examine his
7 own life and we come to another meaning of the word
8 transformation.

9 There have been several books for sale
10 in protest to the atomic testing. Earle Reynolds
11 went to give the jury test of the Golden Rule and
12 he heard the skipper say and it is appropriate for
13 us to hear also: Nuclear explosions, by any
14 nation, are inhuman, immoral and contemptuous
15 crimes against humanity and against all human kind.

16 What my government is doing violates
17 God's law of love and I have no choice but to obey
18 God.

19 That is an illustration of what we might
20 mean by transformation. Transformation from the
21 science and the laboratory to his own life. Earle,
22 later and his wife sailed with his row boat into
23 the atomic test zone of Bikini Atoll because he was
24 anxious to bring to people actual information of
25 what he found in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. He

1 carefully completed his studies on the ionization
2 of those children and then to his horror found that
3 his reports and the truth of what he found was not
4 even available until many, many years later.

5 Friends of his who gave him bits that
6 they found of his report, realize the American
7 agency had distorted what he was saying and
8 minimized the effect on those children.

9 There have been very many protests, some
10 have arrived (inaudible) to the site. The people
11 from Livermore may remember the time when some of
12 us, most of those women, were gailed for
13 protesting -- protesting the expense of university
14 money being spent for research at Lawrence
15 Livermore -- being spent for nuclear research.

16 MR. LAWSON: Miss Foster, how much more
17 do you have? Just a little more?

18 MS. FOSTER: I would like 30 seconds.

19 MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

20 MS. FOSTER: All right. The words
21 differ from what NNSA uses and what we use; but we
22 are not deceived by some things we are doing. Let
23 me be clear about what we do know. We do not want
24 reliable replacement warheads. We do not want new
25 and improved or innovative nuclear weapons. We do

1 not want robust nuclear earth penetrators. Indeed,
2 we do not want any nuclear weapons at all. We do
3 want a comprehensive ban treaty, nuclear ban treaty
4 and we will work for the legal standing of
5 non-nuclear non-proliferation for all nations,
6 thank you.

7 MR. LAWSON: Before I call my next
8 speaker, I have heard a couple of phones or pagers
9 go off -- if you need to talk, take it outside of
10 the room, and if you need to have conversation, go
11 outside. As you can tell, it is difficult to pick
12 up the speakers voices. The next speaker is Maria
13 Cecilia Freeman which will be followed by Sandee
14 Wiedemann and Tara Dorabji.

15 MS. FREEMAN: I am here to speak against
16 the proposed plan to modernize the Nuclear Weapons
17 Complex not on technical or scientific grounds nor
18 on historical or political grounds but for reasons
19 of fundamental common sense and morality. I am
20 addressing those of you here to represent the plan
21 to modernize and transform the Nuclear Weapons
22 Complex. First I want to make three points on the
23 grounds of common sense. These are my concerns:
24 First, the more the United States pursues its
25 policy of maintaining and developing its nuclear

1 arsenal, the more you motivate other entities in
2 the world to do the same. The more the
3 United States pursues its policy of maintaining and
4 increasing its nuclear dominance the more you
5 impassion animosity around the world toward the
6 bullying militarism of our country. The more you
7 continue to develop new and improved nuclear
8 weapons, the more the United States motivates and
9 ensures proliferation, guaranteeing the spread of
10 this deadly technology around the world.

11 Second, the more efficient you make
12 nuclear weapons and the more feasible they are
13 used, the more likely it is that the United States
14 will use them. As you develop more efficient
15 nuclear weapons you are also developing more modern
16 and efficient bombers, missiles and missiles
17 guidance systems to deliver those weapons.

18 At best the continued development of
19 nuclear weapons by the United States makes it more
20 feasible for this country to pursue military
21 domination over other countries through the
22 aggressive use of conventional weapons.

23 Third, the more the United States
24 pursues global military dominance through nuclear
25 superiority, the more likely war becomes. The

1 threat of nuclear weapons in the hands of
2 unfriendly governments is used to justify
3 preventive war to the American public that we have
4 seen in the pretext for the invasion of Iraq and
5 threats against Iran. The fear of nuclear weapons
6 in the hands of others is used to justify a
7 continuing American militarism, this in turn feeds
8 both self perceived and real threats against this
9 country in response. These are horrifying
10 prospects and we have abundant evidence that they
11 are real. The pursuit of global nuclear dominance
12 does not make us safer, it puts us all more in
13 peril. The only way to stop perpetuating this
14 cycle of escalating threat to humanity is to stop
15 the policy you are here to represent to us today.

16 Finally, the United States has a
17 fundamental moral and legal obligation to reverse
18 its pursuit of nuclear superiority. I am ashamed
19 of the hypocrisy and illegal behavior of my country
20 now represented by this complex transformation and
21 you should be, too.

22 Article Six of the United States
23 Constitution states that, quote, all treaties made
24 under the authority of the United States shall be
25 the supreme law of the land. The Nuclear

1 Non-Proliferation Treaty has been the law of the
2 land since 1970. Under Article Six of that treaty,
3 the United States and all other parties to the
4 treaty are obligated to pursue, quote, a cessation
5 of the nuclear arms race at an early date and
6 ultimately to pursue general and complete nuclear
7 disarmament. Not only is the United States failing
8 to meet its legal obligations it is flagrantly
9 dismissing them by working to maintain and develop
10 its nuclear arsenal and tailor its nuclear weapons
11 to new uses.

12 I am addressing you as a fellow citizen
13 because along with you, I share in our collective
14 responsibility for our country's behavior in the
15 world and the threat to humanity it represents. I
16 am asking you to follow the law and to answer to a
17 moral conscience.

18 MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is
19 Sandee Wiedemann. She would be followed by Tara
20 Dorabji and Marylia Kelley, please.

21 MS. WIEDEMANN: Hi, well I am Sandee
22 Wiedemann. I represent Shepherd's Gate in
23 Livermore which is a shelter for homeless and
24 battered women and children. For many, many years
25 the employees of LLNL and Sandia have been a

1 mainstay in support of the women and children who
2 are now contributing members of our community.

3 Through the work at Shepherd's Gate I am
4 very grateful for the unique and essential work the
5 lab does with the proposed changes will come
6 positive results which will benefit our world. I
7 am well aware as are all of you that the entire
8 community has been greatly supported by the lab
9 employees time talents and treasures, I am sure you
10 will agree with that.

11 Shepherd's Gate and I appreciate the
12 value NNSA has placed in Livermore Lab with this
13 plan. That is it. Thank you.

14 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next
15 speaker is Tara Dorabji to be followed by Marylia
16 Kelley and Alan Horn.

17 MS. DORABJI: Hello. My name's Tara
18 Dorabji and thank you for giving me the opportunity
19 to speak and accommodating that I have two small
20 children with me. For years I lived in Livermore
21 and the fate of Livermore nuclear weapons lab is
22 something that is really important to me and to my
23 family and to the future of the world.

24 Complex transformation is annihilation.
25 The continued development of nuclear weapons

1 modified expansion of the nuclear infrastructure
2 destroys our communities, our home, our society,
3 our integrity.

4 Complex transformation builds on the
5 worst possible strain of US nuclear policy. It
6 brings to life the nuclear posture review,
7 something that needs to be changed. We should,
8 instead, build upon the non-proliferation treaty
9 which is also part of the US policy. It is hidden,
10 it is swept away, it is not looked at, but it is
11 what we need to work towards -- disarmament. That
12 means no new nuclear weapons. That means when we
13 talk about the consolidation of the special nuclear
14 materials that first we talk about creating no more
15 waste. So let's close down the plutonium facility
16 here at Livermore Lab, let's stop it, let's scale
17 back the work in Los Alamos. There does not need
18 to be a new facility built for production. No.
19 Let's stop that and then let's look at how are we
20 going to secure this waste? How are we going to
21 secure these materials that we create that are
22 going to be radioactive for hundreds of thousands
23 of years? That is what the scientist needs to do.
24 That is where the funding needs to go, not in
25 creating more, not in endangering the health and

1 safety of our community and when we talk about
2 safety and health I want to point out an actual
3 Academy of Science report that found that women who
4 are exposed to radiation are 50 percent more likely
5 to develop tumors; 38 percent higher to likely to
6 get cancer and die than men, yet most of studies,
7 they study men.

8 Also, the same report found that infant
9 boys that are exposed are three to four more times
10 likely to get cancer than men in their 20's or
11 50's. Infant girls like I have two of, are two
12 times more endangered than their male infant
13 counter parts. So when we talk about safety, let's
14 set it to the most vulnerable population, our baby
15 children and as a mother, no risk is acceptable to
16 me when we are talking about the nuclear radiation
17 and the continued development of nuclear weapons,
18 none. It is my children, it is our earth that we
19 have to take care of, and I hope that NNSA takes
20 this review seriously and provides serious
21 alternatives, alternatives that talk about stopping
22 the continued development of nuclear weapons. That
23 is the heart of NEPA review.

24 And so I just really hope that, you know
25 -- and one more thing I just want to add in is: It

1 just makes me so sad when we are talking about
2 education to see the local politician praising the
3 laboratory for supporting education. We should not
4 have to pander to the nuclear weapons facility to
5 support education. We as a society can fund the
6 education of our children. It is time to invest in
7 education and not weapons of mass destruction.

8 MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Marylia
9 Kelley then Alan Horn and Louise Neal.

10 MS. KELLEY: I am Marylia Kelley, I am
11 executive director of Tri-Valley CARES against a
12 radioactive environment based here in Livermore
13 California and I do speak from and for a very
14 significant sector of the community that's been
15 absent in the speakers so far, so welcome to my
16 community.

17 I live on East Avenue down by Charlotte
18 very close to the Livermore Laboratory and from my
19 city council members, for Marj and Jeff -- are you
20 still here? They are not. That is unfortunate.
21 Tri-Valley CARES has an action in a letter to the
22 Department of Energy requesting six million dollars
23 in funding for the cleanup of Livermore Lab's main
24 site for the cleanup of contaminant plum that left
25 the site and is under my house. If they want to

1 support something at the Laboratory, I challenge
2 them to get this letter, to sign this letter and to
3 ask the Department of Energy to fund things like
4 cleanup to help the City, not fund nuclear weapons,
5 supposedly to help the city. I live here, it does
6 not help me. I have contamination under my home, I
7 have plutonium at high levels in a local park that
8 came from Livermore Lab and Livermore Lab has gone
9 out and analyzed the rainfall in my neighborhood
10 and found high levels of tritium, that's the truth,
11 that's the reality of living in Livermore.

12 We are here today to change that
13 reality. So a few comments: One, the
14 Department of Energy's complex transformation plan
15 does reduce the square footage of building a little
16 bit going from 35 million square feet of nuclear
17 bomb building space to 26 million square feet of
18 new revitalized, rebuilt nuclear bomb building
19 space.

20 We do not accept a slightly smaller
21 Nuclear Weapons Complex refurbished with new
22 capabilities in order to more efficiently turn out
23 new nuclear weapons.

24 In fact, I would argue the most safe,
25 most secure, most cost effective and these nuclear

1 weapons are the ones we do not build. Across the
2 country the DOE will close or transfer about 600
3 old buildings, and again, this is why they are
4 calling it consolidation when it is a thin disguise
5 for the continued development, testing and
6 production of new and militarily modified nuclear
7 weapons.

8 Many of those old buildings are already
9 in the Q to be decontaminated and decommissioned
10 and will be regardless of complex transformation.

11 Let me also --

12 MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

13 MS. KELLEY: How about 45.

14 MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

15 MS. KELLEY: Okay. Let me talk a little
16 bit about the local situation, then. I want to
17 talk a little bit about Livermore Lab and the
18 future of the lab. This plan will keep radioactive
19 tritium at Livermore Lab. That wasn't on the DOE
20 view graphs, but that is what is in the report if
21 you read it carefully. Radioactive tritium has
22 escaped in our air, into our soil and into our
23 ground water. We have documented nearly a million
24 curies of radiation that is tritium coming from the
25 laboratory so we are here today to say that the

1 tritium should be deinventoried from Livermore Lab
2 and, in fact, right now as we are sitting here,
3 Livermore Lab is almost double doubling the size of
4 its tritium facility, it is called the Tritium
5 Modernization Project, I have the blueprints on the
6 back table.

7 Two, regarding the plutonium, they
8 should start, if George Miller is so concerned
9 about it, I suggest that he start packaging it
10 safely now. The Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety
11 Board cited Livermore Lab for having plutonium in
12 food tins and paint cans. Lets's spend some money
13 today getting that safety packaged. If the
14 Laboratory does that it can be taken out of
15 Livermore by 2010 not 2012 safely. It should be
16 moved once and only once to a safe, secure, more
17 remote location and never, never used in nuclear
18 weapons experiments again.

19 The DOE said --

20 MR. LAWSON: Miss Kelly. Come back
21 after everyone has spoken if you want to go on.

22 MS. KELLEY: Let me just make a quick --
23 I appreciate it.

24 MR. LAWSON: Go ahead.

25 MS. KELLEY: Just because it was

1 deceptive in the view graph. They talk about the
2 bomb blast leaving Site 300. That is only the bomb
3 blast that are being sponsored by the
4 Department of Energy. Livermore Lab has a permit
5 right now to increase the bomb blasts open air
6 outdoors at site 300 but they are going to do it as
7 work for others for the Department of Defense and
8 for the Department of Homeland Security.

9 Our health, our environment don't care
10 which agency pays for it, it is harmful. Thank you
11 very much.

12 MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Alan
13 Horn and following Mr. Horn will be Louise Neal and
14 Cara Bautista.

15 MR. HORN: My name is Alan Horn. I live
16 in Sonoma County about 87 miles upwind from the
17 nuclear bomb factory here in Livermore known as
18 Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory. I am an
19 officer in Veterans For Peace, Sonoma County. Our
20 mission, one of our mission, in Veterans For Peace
21 is to eliminate nuclear bombs and another mission
22 is to abolish war as an instrument of national
23 policy.

24 When I enlisted in the United States
25 military I raised my right hand and swore to a

1 solemn oath that I would protect and defend the
2 constitution of the United States from all enemies
3 foreign and domestic.

4 The fact that I was honorably discharged
5 from the United States military did not absolve me
6 from that -- from honoring that solemn oath. I am
7 here today in furtherance of my sworn duty.

8 While in the United States military, I
9 received very specialized training in NBC warfare,
10 that stand for nuclear biological and chemical
11 warfare.

12 I, in fact, own a Geiger counter and I
13 have been taken readings throughout this afternoon
14 and we are getting slightly elevated radiation
15 levels here in this auditorium. About, oh, just a
16 few clicks over normal, normal is about 11.3 clicks
17 per minute, we are getting on an average about 13,
18 14 clicks per minute.

19 Dr. John Gaughman, the late Dr. John
20 Gaughman is very fond of saying and I quote: There
21 is no such thing as a safe level of radiation,
22 unquote.

23 The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
24 which was ratified by the United States senate, is
25 in fact, the law of the United States and since we

1 are a nation of laws, we must obey them. On behalf
2 of the people of the United States of America, I
3 hereby order you to obey our laws and to cease and
4 to desist nuclear bomb activities immediately. The
5 consequences of your action will effect all life on
6 earth. Millions of people have died from nuclear
7 bombs and nuclear activities of all kinds including
8 thousands of United States military personnel.

9 It is long past time that we honor these
10 heroes as well as the other people who have been
11 bombed like the Japanese, and all beings and make
12 this earth safe for future generations by
13 destroying nuclear bombs.

14 MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds please.

15 MR. HORN: It is disingenuous of the
16 Department of Energy to point to reduction of
17 nuclear bombs and to say that you are in compliance
18 with a non-proliferation treaty. You are not in
19 compliance with the treaty nor are you in
20 compliance with the United States constitution.
21 Just look at those pictures over there of what
22 small nuclear bombs will do to human flesh.

23 If you persist, if you continue to
24 violate the laws of the United States of America,
25 we will arrest you and put you on trial for crimes

1 against humanity. The whole world is watching.

2 MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Louise
3 Neal and followed by Cara Bautista.

4 MS. NEAL: My name is Louise Neal and I
5 am from Oakland, California I represent Beacon
6 Presbyterian Fellowship.

7 Nuclear weapons are dangerously obsolete
8 and a threat to our very existence on planet earth.
9 I pray that God will help us to move away from the
10 nuclear precipice, from which our current nuclear
11 policies have propelled us.

12 Four extremely prominent and reliable
13 people have stepped forward to help us move toward
14 a world free of nuclear weapons. These are none
15 other than former Secretary of State, George
16 Schultz; Henry Kissinger and former Secretary of
17 Defense, William Perry and former Chairman of the
18 Senate Armed Services Committee, Sam Nunn.

19 These have co-authored a plan to move
20 the United States and the world away from the
21 nuclear precipice.

22 Envisioning a world free of nuclear
23 weapons, their plan is endorsed by two-thirds of
24 the living Secretaries of State; Secretaries of
25 Defense and the national security advisors. This

1 is their opening paragraph in an article appearing
2 in the January 15, 2008 Wall Street Journal
3 entitled: Toward A Nuclear Free World.

4 The accelerating spread of nuclear
5 weapons, nuclear know-how and nuclear material has
6 brought us to a nuclear tipping point. We face a
7 very real possibility that the deadliest weapons
8 ever invented could fall into dangerous hands. The
9 steps we are now taking to address these threats
10 are not adequate to the danger. With nuclear
11 weapons more widely available, deterrent is
12 decreasingly effective and increasingly hazardous.
13 This is the quote from these four prominent people.

14 Complex transformations goals -- to
15 reduce the nuclear weapons stockpile by 50 percent
16 and to certify the safety and security of the
17 stockpile are consistent with creating a
18 nuclear-free world envisioned by these former
19 secretaries Schultz, Kissinger, Perry and Senator
20 Nunn.

21 However, complex transformation other
22 goals of quote to maintain a capability to design,
23 develop and produce new or adapted warheads and
24 ensure that warheads are available to augment the
25 operationally deployed force, unquote, are not

1 consistent with the goal of a nuclear free world.

2 Instead, they represent a costly and a
3 dangerous step in the wrong direction that may well
4 tip us over the nuclear precipice.

5 I urge NNSA, in the very least, to
6 consult with George Schultz; Henry Kissinger;
7 Secretary of Defense, former Secretary of Defense,
8 William Perry and former chairman of the house
9 senate armed service committee Sam Nunn, when they
10 are developing their plans. We need to step away
11 from the nuclear precipice and towards a nuclear
12 free world. Thank you.

13 MR. LAWSON: Before our next speaker I
14 just remind all of you that I know three minutes is
15 not much time. If you do have written comments
16 that exceed that, please send them to us so we will
17 have them on record.

18 The next speaker is Cara Bautista
19 followed by Matthew Swyers and Aaron Thomas.

20 MS. BAUTISTA: My name is Cara Bautista,
21 I am the deputy political director of Peace Action
22 West, the region's largest and oldest lobby group
23 for a just and informed policy and smarter
24 security. I have with me more than 900 postcards
25 from members of the community for Mr. Wyka which I

1 will present to him later today.

2 We have nearly 50,000 supporters in the
3 western United States. Complex transformation is
4 fundamentally a plan to revamp and the Nuclear
5 Weapons Complex and allow for the production of new
6 nuclear warheads. Peace Action West has been
7 working in communities to oppose this and the
8 public is with us. Part of complex transformation
9 is a plan to build a larger plutonium complex at
10 the Los Alamos National Laboratory in New Mexico
11 allowing for up to 80 plutonium bombs to be built
12 each year. It is clear that this is a plan that
13 involves the production of new nuclear warheads,
14 even though it's being billed as a way to reduce
15 our nuclear arsenal. The main rationale that our
16 current warheads are aging, unreliable is not true.

17 The Lawrence Livermore Laboratory,
18 Los Alamos Laboratories and the Jason Defense
19 Advisory Group have all done studies who have
20 determined the current lifetime of pits are between
21 85 to 100 years. So there is no rush to create
22 more nuclear plutonium pit bombs.

23 Instead of investing 150 billion dollars
24 of tax money into this project, we need to have a
25 national debate about the future of US nuclear

1 weapons.

2 Currently, Senator Feinstein and others
3 have legislation pending asking the next President
4 to complete a new nuclear posture review and
5 congress has consistently cut funding for these
6 types of programs including the reliable
7 replacement warheads and nuclear bunker busters.

8 The policies out there in support of a
9 new direction away from Bushes nuclear posture
10 review. We have had a moratorium on nuclear
11 testing since 1992. It is unlikely that the
12 military will accept an untested weapon such as the
13 reliable replacement warhead into their arsenal and
14 this could open the door again to future weapons
15 testing at sites such as the Nevada test site.

16 Complex transformation also sends a
17 dangerous message to the international community.
18 At a time when we are negotiating with other
19 countries like Iran and North Korea to prevent them
20 from developing nuclear weapons programs, our
21 message is contrary to the goal of working together
22 for a nonnuclear world.

23 Finally, this does not ensure safety for
24 the American public. The Department of Energy
25 should consider not producing any new nuclear

1 warheads in the future and reducing our stockpile
2 in compliance with the Nuclear Non-Proliferation
3 Treaty to keep these weapons out of the hands of
4 terrorists and other groups. The safest policy is
5 one that has no nuclear weapons for any country and
6 the US should work towards that. Thank you.

7 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next
8 speaker is Matthew Swyers and then Aaron Thomas and
9 Rebecca Griffin.

10 MR. SWYERS: My name is Matthew Swyers.
11 I am a resident of Livermore. I am a disabled
12 class musician and I have training in physics,
13 electronics, computer hardware and programming and
14 I am a member of Tri-Valley CARES.

15 Thank you for the opportunity to
16 publicly voice my protest against the planned
17 complex transformation. Complex bombplex, as I
18 call it, is the latest scheme representing the
19 larger lie which is the driving force behind its
20 latest proposal. Contrary to the pronouncements by
21 our so-called leaders, it is our country, the
22 United States which is the single greatest threat
23 to the world for weapons of mass destruction.

24 Some might call this treason and it
25 gives me no pleasure to state what has become

1 obvious but unspoken in the climate of fear which
2 has been promoted by many of our leaders as proof
3 we only need to look at our shared nuclear history.

4 The United States was the first nation
5 to develop and the only country to use nuclear
6 weapons twice. The US squandered four years from
7 1945 to 1949 when the Soviets tested their first
8 weapon, time which could have been used to
9 negotiate complete disarmament with our one time
10 ally of as many years earlier. We did not.

11 Eisenhower's attence for peace program
12 was intended to offer other nations the peaceful
13 use of nuclear information and technology in
14 exchange for promising to forego the acquisition of
15 nuclear weapons. This has been an unmitigated
16 disaster. Nuclear energy and nuclear weapons are
17 married at the hip. One only needs to look at
18 their proximity within the Department of Energy to
19 realize this.

20 And could someone please explain to me
21 why nuclear weapons fall into the purview of the
22 Department of Energy? Our nation has serious
23 energy problems that need to be addressed but I am
24 certain that the lack of nuclear weapons is not one
25 of them.

1 Attence for peace did not stop the drive
2 to possess nuclear weapons but instead accelerated
3 it. Pakistan and others have used the program to
4 obtain technology training and information for
5 their weapons programs. Nuclear power increases
6 the likelihood that nuclear materials, technology
7 and information will be diverted to make weapons
8 besides being insanelly costly, polluting and
9 dangerous. No matter what our leaders tell us,
10 nuclear power isn't green, carbon neutral safe or
11 cost effective. The entire nuclear infrastructure
12 benefits only large multi-national corporations who
13 profit financially and the bankrupt politicians who
14 promote force and threats of force as a substitute
15 for foreign policy.

16 In the words of (inaudible), nuclear
17 arms states are criminal states, they have a legal
18 obligation confirmed by the world court to live up
19 to Article Six of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation
20 Treaty which calls on them to carry out good faith
21 negotiations to eliminate nuclear weapons entirely.

22 None of the nuclear states have lived up
23 to it. What is more terrifying than a vision of
24 all life on earth annihilated in a blinding blast
25 of light, heat and radiation in the blink of an

1 eye. This is the ultimate terrorism. We face a
2 choice between life and death. I have chosen life.
3 Beat the swords of Lawrence Livermore Lab into the
4 plowshares of peaceful research. Stop the complex
5 bombplex.

6 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next
7 speaker is Aaron Thomas to be followed by Rebecca
8 Griffin and Rita Perry.

9 MR. THOMAS: I just can't wait to read
10 more about what the NNSA has to say.

11 So my name's Aaron Thomas. I work with
12 Peace Action West and we -- field canvas director.
13 I am very concerned. There are many reasons why I
14 am concerned that is probably why I don't have to
15 talk about all of them.

16 Talking about Livermore Lab's for just a
17 second and their budget, I took a look at it last
18 year, and it was the fiscal year 2007 and then
19 projected for 2008, there wasn't a big difference
20 between the two, but, in general, what we were
21 looking at is that 85 percent of their budget is
22 for nuclear weapons, program research and
23 development and about five percent for green.

24 Now just consider where we are at right
25 now in this world and the problems we face and

1 thinking about the fact that these scientists that
2 are employed for labs like these are among the
3 smartest and most talented in the world. It
4 troubles me that they are being used to create
5 weapons of mass destruction instead of developing
6 ways that we can save this planet.

7 Complex transformation has a projected
8 price tag on it, it is 150 billion tax dollars. I
9 am sure we are all taxpayers here, right, on some
10 level or another. I bet we can think of better
11 ways to spend our tax dollars. I certainly can.

12 And, I mean, just in general, look at
13 our economy right now. This is not economically
14 viable at any level.

15 So now talking about the current
16 maintenance of our stockpile and what has been
17 current for I believe going on two decades if not
18 more, the stockpile stewardship program, right, and
19 I am not here to say that I am -- that I like the
20 stockpile stewardship program, because it is about
21 maintaining our current arsenal, but looking at the
22 argument that we need to have a more reliable
23 arsenal, well the same people that are telling us
24 that have been saying that the stockpile
25 stewardship program does just that.

1 I would love it if we were here today to
2 talk about complex disassembly, not transformation.

3 MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

4 MR. THOMAS: And finally, since I work
5 for a peace and diplomacy organization that focuses
6 on US foreign policy, I guess to try to spend a
7 minute to talk about that or 30 seconds, maybe.

8 Hypocrisy does not equal smart diplomacy
9 and redeveloping our nuclear stockpile, I don't
10 care what name you want to tag on it, it is
11 proliferation any way you cut it and if we want to
12 get serious about being positive players in the
13 world community, we need to stop being
14 hypocritical. This has gone on way too long.
15 Let's get a little smarter than we have been
16 because this is pretty ridiculous. Thank you.

17 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next
18 speaker is Rebecca Griffin. Miss Perry will be
19 followed by Rita Perry and Betty Brown.

20 MS. GRIFFIN: Hi, my name is Rebecca
21 Griffin, I am the political director for Peace
22 Action West. The complex transformation program
23 that we are looking at we currently spend billions
24 of dollars to solve problems that don't exist and
25 to make the problems that we already have worse

1 than they currently are.

2 We have already heard a lot today about
3 how every rationale for this program has been
4 undermined. We know that the plutonium pits are in
5 current arsenal for the last 100 years. The Bush
6 administration trying to scare up support in
7 Congress sent a letter saying that if we don't fund
8 the reliable replacement warhead, part of this
9 plan, that we'll have to start testing our nuclear
10 weapons again. So they are saying that we are
11 going to test weapons that have already been tested
12 and it is better to take a new completely untested
13 weapon and that the military is going will be
14 satisfied with that weapon in its arsenal. They
15 are saying that this is part of reducing our
16 stockpile. We can reduce our nuclear stockpile
17 without complex transformation, it is a unnecessary
18 waste of taxpayer dollars.

19 This plan is based on the nuclear
20 posture view by the Bush administration in 2001.
21 This is a document that calls for our nuclear
22 weapons to be more usable. It calls for
23 potentially using nuclear weapons in a first-strike
24 situation against countries that don't even have
25 nuclear weapons including countries like Iran,

1 countries like Syria. What kind of a message does
2 that send to countries like Iran that we will
3 attack you if you don't develop nuclear weapons, if
4 you develop nuclear weapons, and they see a country
5 like Iraq that didn't have nuclear weapons and it
6 was attack by the US. You see a country like North
7 Korea that did have nuclear weapons and wasn't
8 attacked by the US. The US policy is giving
9 legitimacy to nuclear weapons in the
10 international community. It is saying that this
11 should be a credible part of your security.

12 Unfortunately, Congress has had the
13 sense to cut the funding for every new nuclear
14 weapons program that has come through the pipeline
15 in the past few years and we will be continuing our
16 work at Peace Action West to make sure that that
17 happens.

18 Earlier we talked about the (inaudible)
19 that Henry Kissinger and his colleagues put out and
20 that statement reinforced what those of us in the
21 nuclear disarmament movement have known for years
22 and years that eliminating nuclear weapons is the
23 smart thing to do, the pragmatic thing to do and it
24 is the moral thing to do.

25 MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds please.

1 MS. GRIFFIN: Sure, our strategy for
2 security shouldn't be based on habit. We have
3 always had nuclear weapons and should continue to
4 have them. To be based on the realistic threat
5 that we face and right now, coincidentally, we are
6 commemorating the 5th anniversary of the war in
7 Iraq, that we are working to end. With this
8 program we have the opportunity to reverse what is
9 another tragic mistake in US foreign policy which
10 is the development of nuclear weapons so our
11 preferred alternative is a disarmament alternative.
12 This is not in the DOE's plan but it should be and
13 we encourage the Department of Energy to look at
14 what is ultimately going to make us safer as a
15 nation and more secure which is the elimination of
16 nuclear weapons, thank you.

17 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Miss Griffin,
18 you severely tested our Court Reporter, I have
19 never seen him so intense.

20 Our next speaker is Rita Perry. She
21 will be followed by Betty Brown and Jahsiah Ault.

22 MS. PERRY: I am Rita Perry a resident
23 of Oakland and a member of the East Bay Peace
24 Action Executive Board and I am speaking on behalf
25 of our chapter membership in Alameda and Contra

1 Costa counties.

2 We wish to express our opposition to the
3 complex transformation plan and the development of
4 the reliable replacement warhead out of our concern
5 for nuclear weapons proliferation. We would also
6 point out that regardless of the income of the --
7 regardless of the outcome of the next election, a
8 new administration will take office, it is
9 premature for the Department of Energy to make long
10 lasting decisions on Nuclear Weapons Complex of the
11 future. Instead the US should carry out its
12 obligations under The Non-Proliferation Treaty,
13 Article Six to reduce and eliminate nuclear
14 weapons. Current US warheads modern safety
15 standards is hypercritical or hypocritical for the
16 US to proceed with the reliable replacement warhead
17 which would constitute a new nuclear weapon and at
18 the same time attempted to sway other nations from
19 developing nuclear weapons.

20 We support the call for a fresh review
21 of US nuclear policy involving congress and the
22 public in a national debate and we call for
23 cancellation of the reliable replacement warhead
24 program.

25 We would like the conversion of nuclear

1 research facilities to peaceful pursuit and
2 analysis as an alternative. Thank you for your
3 attention.

4 MR. LAWSON: Thank you.

5 MS. BROWN: I am Betty Brown.

6 MR. LAWSON: Excuse me, Ms. Brown. And
7 hang on just one second. Thank you very much Miss
8 Perry. After Betty Brown will be Jahsiah Ault and
9 then Michael Walt. Okay, thank you.

10 MS. BROWN: Again, I am a resident of
11 Kensington and a retired school public health
12 nurse. As a member of the El Cerrito Democratic
13 Clubs executive board I have been authorized to
14 speak briefly on the Club's behalf. We are opposed
15 to the Department of Energy's proposed complex
16 transformation plan that would allow for production
17 of new warheads such as the reliable replacement
18 warhead with the overall cost of 150 billion, as
19 was mentioned before, of taxpayer money. We echo
20 some of the views expressed in the January 4th, '07
21 Op Ed that has been referred to as before in the
22 Wall Street Journal by George Schultz, William
23 Perry, Henry Kissinger and Sam Nunn who stated
24 nuclear weapons today present tremendous dangers
25 and they went on to call for a world free of

1 nuclear weapons.

2 I would also like to quote from a
3 February 28th letter I just received from Senator
4 Feinstein. She states and I quote: I believe the
5 United States and other nuclear powers should work
6 to reduce and, where possible, eliminate the number
7 of nuclear warhead weapons we have around the
8 world. These catastrophic weapons of war threaten
9 entire nations and fuel a dangerous nuclear arms
10 race. Addressing the spread of weapons of mass
11 destruction ought to be one of our nation's top
12 national security priorities.

13 To conclude, I join, we join with many
14 others in calling for a thorough national debate,
15 but first stopping all work on research,
16 engineering and evaluating of new nuclear weapons,
17 thank you.

18 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Betty. Our next
19 speaker Jahsiah Ault and then Michael Walt and
20 Jedidiyah deVries.

21 MR. AULT: Hi. My name is Jahsiah Ault.
22 I am a member with Peace Action West and I am a
23 former school teacher. I worked in a preschool for
24 four years and after doing extensive work in the
25 communities all across the Bay Area, I come to

1 represent the thousands of people out here who
2 could not be here today. I have collected over a
3 thousand petitions opposing the complex
4 transformation so I am here to speak for those
5 people.

6 One, in particular, I received a letter
7 and it said: I do not like nuclear weapons. They
8 make me sad. They hurt people and they are bad for
9 our earth. This is a letter from a young girl
10 named Samantha, age 6. And I think at age 6 to see
11 somebody with such a beautiful conscious saying
12 such wonderful words, it really provoked me, and
13 it -- I did not want to speak here today, but I
14 knew that she couldn't so I am here to speak for
15 her and I wonder why that a six-year-old can see
16 the dangers of nuclear weapons and yet elected
17 officials can't.

18 So I am here to speak for her and I
19 would like that be known.

20 We also have petitions in the back that
21 we are continuing to get signed and we will be
22 delivering them. Thank you for your time.

23 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. We now call on
24 Mike Walt and Jedidiyah deVries and Jan Harwood.

25 MR. WALT: Hi, my name is Michael. For

1 the past few months I have had the wonderful
2 opportunity of campaigning with Peace Action
3 against complex transformation.

4 Through it I have met a myriad of people
5 with an equally diverse set of opinions, liberals
6 and conservatives both for and against, scientists
7 from the Livermore Lab. The points have been made,
8 argued and stereotypes have been broken but through
9 it all one thing has become undeniably apparent.
10 This nation, this planet stands on the brink of
11 radical change and that our future is being decided
12 today by programs such as this one.

13 And I believe that I speak for my
14 generation when I say that peace and security are
15 my political priorities, yet living in a world
16 where my government condemns nations for pursuing
17 weapons of mass destruction, then deems it moral
18 and necessary to spend billions on technology with
19 the sole purpose of inducing untold death is not a
20 representation of my values and I refuse to believe
21 that it is my future.

22 Those who say we need these weapons are
23 clutching to the ragged tatters of an aged and
24 broken paradigm and we the people of these
25 United States will join hands, stand against

1 corruption and stomp out hypocrisy. There is no
2 room in the new world for nuclear weapons. There
3 is no room in the new world for complex
4 transformation. Adherence to the Nuclear
5 Non-Proliferation Treaty eventual disarmament is
6 not just wanted but a requirement if we are ever to
7 attain peace. Thank you.

8 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, our next speaker
9 is Jedidiyah deVries then Jan Harwood and Roger
10 Logan.

11 MR. DeVRIES: Hi. Welcome to Livermore.
12 My name is Jedidiyah deVries and I am the outreach
13 director for Tri-Valley Communities against a
14 radioactive environment. I live a couple blocks
15 that way. Feel free to stop by and say hi at any
16 time.

17 First I would like to thank everybody
18 for coming out. As somebody who works on the issue
19 of nuclear weapons every day, it can be somewhat
20 disheartening but it is wonderful to see so many
21 people out here, so many people who care about
22 their community and so many people who care about
23 the future of where this country is going.

24 As outreach director I spend a lot of
25 time out in the community and my friends often ask

1 me: What is it like to go out and talk about the
2 issue of nuclear weapons in a town where the
3 largest employer is a nuclear weapons lab?

4 I tell them that when I am out gathering
5 petitions or passing information at the farmers
6 market the number one response I get from people
7 who work at the lab is nervous laughter. Nervous
8 laughter because they are unable to confront the
9 fact that when they -- that where they go to work
10 every day to build nuclear weapons. The response
11 is not I work at the lab and therefore I am for
12 nuclear weapons, the response is I work at the lab
13 and therefore I better not think about this, touch
14 on this issue or really think through the
15 consequences. What we are doing here today and
16 what we are asking NNSA to do is to think through
17 the consequences of their actions.

18 And it is not just the people who work
19 at the lab in this town. Well, first of all, one
20 time at the farmers market I got a different
21 response from someone who worked at the lab. He
22 actually came up to me and thanked me for passing
23 out information about the lab. He actually told
24 me: It is not that I agree with you, I like my job
25 and I don't normally have an opinion on nuclear

1 weapons, but I want to thank you because I don't
2 trust the lab. I don't trust the lab to think
3 about the environmental and health consequences for
4 the community. I don't trust the lab to be open
5 about what is happening in this town. So I am glad
6 there is somebody holding the lab accountable and
7 forcing the lab to pay attention to the community.

8 It is not just about the people that
9 work at the lab. I, when I go out, get a sandwich
10 at my favorite sandwich place or just am in the
11 store, people often ask me: Do you work at the
12 lab? Because that is the number one occupation
13 here, especially for somebody my age, looks like I
14 just got out of college, they assume you work at
15 the lab. This whole town is focused on a nuclear
16 weapons lab. When you meet somebody on the street,
17 the first response is, oh, they might work at a
18 nuclear weapons lab designing weapons of mass
19 destruction.

20 MR. LAWSON: Thirty seconds.

21 MR. DeVRIES: I will try to speak very
22 quickly. It goes beyond just, it affects the
23 entire families. When we were holding an antiwar
24 vigil once, there was a wife of someone who worked
25 at the lab, when the reporter came to take a

1 picture of the vigil she held up the sign to cover
2 her face because didn't want to be associated with
3 that because she wasn't sure as the wife of
4 somebody who works at the lab whether it was okay
5 to have an opinion about the most important issues.

6 One last story. One time I was out in
7 front of a supermarket and Tri-Valley CARES, as any
8 other community organization is allowed to have a
9 display in the public library. One time while I
10 was out in front of a supermarket a woman came up
11 with her two children and said are you the group
12 that had the display in the community center? I
13 said: Yes, yes we are. She said: My father,
14 these children's grandfather worked at the Lab. He
15 is retired now but he worked at the Lab. My
16 children, they idolize him, they think: Oh, I have
17 this really cool grandfather he got to work in this
18 really cool science lab. They absolutely love him.
19 I knew what he did. He worked on nuclear weapons
20 and I didn't know how to tell my children that
21 their grandfather, whom they loved, that he worked
22 on nuclear weapons. When we passed your display in
23 the library they tugged on my sleeve saying: Mom,
24 mom, what is this about? Is this the lab? What is
25 going on?

1 It was an opportunity for her to open up
2 a conversation that she was unable to have with her
3 own children about what their grandfather did.

4 This plan for the future of Nuclear
5 Weapons Complex might be a wonderful plan full of
6 technical details, but it is missing one thing, it
7 is missing people, the effects of on people, it is
8 missing the communities. It is missing the people
9 of Livermore and it is also missing the people of
10 Hiroshima, Nagasaki, the people of Iraq. It is
11 missing the actual people. So as our director we
12 have been just going out, these are just some of
13 the post cards, some of the comments we have been
14 gathering from the people out in the community.

15 MR. LAWSON: If you'd like to come back
16 after we finish --

17 MR. DeVRIES: Would like to say, we will
18 hand these in and we have a thousand more. We
19 would like the NNSA to think of the people. Thank
20 you.

21 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next
22 speaker is Jan Harwood and then Roger Logan and
23 then Jerry Dow.

24 MS. HARWOOD: I am Jan Harwood. I am
25 from Santa Cruz Women's International League for

1 Peace and Freedom, the oldest women's peace
2 organization in the world, 92 years old. I am also
3 a raging granny.

4 People have been talking about how
5 children think about this business and I think
6 children are the only ones with enough sense to
7 really comprehend. A five-year-old knows that it
8 is wrong to kill one person and that you could end
9 up in prison for the rest of your life for doing
10 that and that you should.

11 So what you folks are working on here is
12 something that will kill millions of people, maybe
13 everybody and every life form. The same is true
14 for the environment. There is nothing worse for
15 the environment than a nuclear war or a nuclear
16 bomb or the nuclear materials that are put into
17 these bombs, dug up and refined and put into these
18 bombs -- and a seven-year-old can understand
19 that -- and I don't know how you guys talk to your
20 children and your grandchildren and explain these
21 things to them.

22 Grown-ups, however, have mostly gotten
23 to the point where we buy into all this language
24 and we don't understand these simple matters again,
25 anymore -- words like complex transformation;

1 centers of excellence; pillars, reliable --

2 I particularly like SNM. It is murder
3 and it is mass murder and that is all that it is
4 and it is the wiping out of everything that we have
5 ever valued in the whole history of human
6 existence.

7 MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds.

8 MS. HARWOOD: I just want to say that
9 when I was a young mother with three little kids, I
10 joined SANE, the committee for A sane nuclear
11 policies, which was maybe some kind of counter name
12 for MAD, a mutual assured destruction and we have
13 been insane in this country for the last 50-some
14 years, ever since 1945, and if we don't get out of
15 it soon, it will be too late.

16 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Roger Logan and
17 there Jerry Dow and then Annie Boddum.

18 MR. LOGAN: I am a pretty peaceful guy
19 so don't get too mad at me. My name is Roger
20 Logan. I worked in this industry at both
21 Los Alamos and Livermore Labs.

22 I have technical and leadership
23 responsibility of one sort or another for every
24 nuclear system in our current stockpile. I was our
25 first leader of directed stockpile work, DSW, I

1 have assisted in the annual certification process
2 every year since it began in 1996.

3 My comments. First, thank you for
4 changing the name from Complex 2030 to Complex
5 Transformation.

6 Second, thank you for recognizing the
7 Complex Transformation must support our current
8 stockpile and The Reliable Replacement Warhead RNW
9 can and should be considered separately.

10 But, my theme is to make sure the
11 Preferred Alternative One, enables NNSA to keep its
12 promises including some promises long overdue to
13 support the current nuclear stockpile. Trust is
14 built on promises that are kept, not promises that
15 are broken. This is an essential prerequisite for
16 future trust from the taxpayers and then second
17 avoid locking us in to a course of action that the
18 de facto compels the future of untested unvalidated
19 nuclear designs, regardless of the acronym of the
20 year, whether it is RNF, RNW or whatever.

21 The third takes maximum advantage of the
22 capabilities of the Livermore Lab and fourth that
23 it provide maximum stability to our lab and our
24 community whether the long term trend is up, down
25 or steady.

1 I have five questions, I requested NNSA
2 respond in writing specifically to the following
3 questions and that these responses not be part of a
4 lump or collective general responses.

5 As authorized here and a classifier of
6 ADC I constructed these questions to enable
7 simplified unclassified yes or no answers plus
8 elaboration.

9 I believe these questions and
10 appropriate responses are to benefit our nuclear
11 stockpile future and the future of the Livermore
12 Lab site.

13 Question one: The preferred alternative
14 mentions manufacture of cases at Y-12. Does the
15 preferred alternative include facilities of funding
16 to develop, qualify, produce and certify WR cases
17 to the same specs and processes as current WR for
18 each current stockpile system?

19 Question two: New pits. The 50/80
20 alternative agrees with our assessment of what is
21 needed to support either the slep (phonetic) or
22 curatorship or best combo stockpile futures. See
23 attachment.

24 However, there is more to pits than just
25 the gray W-ADA (phonetic). Does the preferred

1 alternative include facilities and funding to
2 support, manufacture and certification of all pit
3 types in the current stockpile.

4 Question three: New pits, does the
5 preferred alternative provide an unclassified cost
6 ratio such as 2X or twenty percent extra, et
7 cetera, for the use of raw instead of cast
8 processes.

9 Question four: Fog bank. I commend the
10 brevity and conservatism of the recent NNSA
11 comments on this material. With that said, does
12 the preferred alternative include facilities and
13 funding to timely produce WR quality fog bank as
14 needed for any and all rebuilds of the current
15 stockpile.

16 Question five: Does the preferred
17 alternative provide a mechanism for the
18 introduction within existing securities perimeters
19 such as the Livermore site of small, agile, cost
20 effective contractors to compliment or even compete
21 with the major contractors, LLNS Lab, Sandia, et
22 cetera, for deliverables that are running overdue
23 such as WR material processes, certification
24 methodologies and assessments, et cetera.

25 Summary: For the preferred alternative

1 to provide an acceptable future for our lab and our
2 nuclear deterrent and to enable essential promises
3 of the past to be kept the above questions must be
4 answered with appropriate budget and environmental
5 information included and the answer to each of
6 these questions must be yes.

7 Thank you very much for this opportunity
8 for public comment on this important matter.

9 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Next speaker is
10 Jerry Dow. We are going ask Mr. Dow if you can
11 hold up a minute, we still have about 25 speakers.
12 The Court Reporter has asked if we can take a five
13 minute break so we he can stretch his fingers a
14 bit. We will be right back with Mr. Dow,
15 Miss Boddum and Dale Nesbitt.

16 (Short recess).

17 MR. LAWSON: Okay. The next speaker
18 will be Jerry Dow followed by Annie Boddum and Dale
19 Nesbitt.

20 MR. DOW: Thank you, my name is
21 Jerry Dow. I want to thank you for letting me come
22 here to give my comments and in the spirit of full
23 disclosure I worked at the Laboratory for
24 thirty-seven and a half years and have been retired
25 for three years. I am presently doing contract

1 work for NNSA and for a private company that works
2 under contract to try to get contracts from NNSA so
3 I am happy in my own consulting business. Three
4 items that I would like to address for this
5 transformation plan.

6 First, how can one define complex of the
7 future, for example, with this plan, without having
8 a national policy. We have it backwards. You have
9 to define the policy first before you can define
10 what results will we. National nuclear policy
11 would include things like nuclear proliferation
12 arms control, energy and nuclear weapons.

13 A subset of this national policy would
14 be a national nuclear weapons policy. That needs
15 to be established as a national commitment one way
16 or the other before you can decide what you are
17 going to do. So it has to identify the stockpile
18 content, the revised stockpile to meet future
19 threats, it has to be agile, and it has to address
20 changes in the design requirements like yield to
21 weight ratio, threats, target sets.

22 And it has to identify what the advances
23 were and have been due to the stockpiles
24 stewardship program. Given that the stockpile
25 stewardship program has had advances then it can

1 decide what the next policy and the next complex
2 should be by building on the old stockpile
3 stewardship program for the stockpiled
4 stewardship program of the future.

5 We had Complex 21, to Complex 2010,
6 Complex 2030 and now we have this. If I remember
7 the twenty-first, the Complex 21 closed two sites
8 which is /PA /TPHAL is and so so. We didn't have a
9 good metric at that time to determine what the
10 result of that would be as far as the stated cost
11 savings of closing these plants. I am here to tell
12 you there were no cost savings.

13 By all metrics and the change in that
14 complex took longer and cost more than was
15 anticipated. Nevertheless, it is a good idea to
16 try to make things more efficient. Congress has
17 required this policy that I have been talking
18 about, nuclear policy now by law in
19 the appropriation. After several years of prodding
20 NNSA and other parts of DOE, this is the most
21 important assignment of NNSA now, to establish that
22 national nuclear weapons policy.

23 MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds.

24 MR. DOW: My God, already? What is real
25 Complex Transformation? I understand why you have

1 to do this document. It has to address a lot of
2 things that have happened, it has to address the
3 future, requirements, security, emission design.
4 This transformation document addresses efficiencies
5 of operations, something that we should have said:
6 Why weren't we doing before? It begs the question.
7 This is not real change, it is a modified change of
8 what we see today, not of the future, I suggest
9 they do that. The document fails to address
10 perhaps the most important part of transformation
11 and that is the gain efficiency quickly to help and
12 perhaps completely pay for the ten to twenty
13 billion dollars of new facilities outlined in this
14 report. Efficiency gains in the future, perhaps
15 you can get from this plan, while you need to
16 establish a way to get the money today. Today,
17 meaning the next couple of years. That can be
18 done. It has been done in one organization in NNSA
19 and do you that by elimination of some of the
20 bureaucracies. And you have a metric of how to
21 accomplish this. If you eliminate 30 percent of
22 the bureaucracies, the total cost to NNSA can be
23 recovered. Thirty percent of six billion dollars
24 is 1.8 billion dollars per year, if you sued you'd
25 only get fifteen percent efficiency, that is nine

1 hundred million dollars a year. That can pay and
2 it could happen within the next two years, that can
3 pay ten to twenty billion dollars.

4 MR. LAWSON: To ask you to finish.

5 MR. DOW: Thanks for your attention and
6 your consideration. And I have a piece of paper
7 here that defines what bureaucracies are.

8 I ask that you consider my remarks and
9 don't make the assumption that because I didn't
10 address all aspects of the document, it isn't
11 because either I haven't thought about it or it
12 hasn't been or can't be addressed by others. You
13 can't address in three minutes what several hundred
14 pages of documents are. Thank you.

15 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. You raised the
16 question, if you have some documents you would like
17 to cite, please give us that information.

18 Our next speaker is Annie Boddum and
19 then Dale Nesbitt and Phyllis Olin.

20 MS. BODDUM: My name is Annie Boddum. I
21 am a member of The Women's International League for
22 Peace and Freedom and I live in the area of
23 Livermore Lab, I am also a pediatric nurse
24 practitioner. So I think there is three big
25 problems to living downwind from the Livermore Lab

1 and the first is the nuclear replacement plan which
2 might remove nuclear weapons from the lab but it
3 also involves a lot of transporting them.

4 The second is the new germ warfare lab
5 at the Lab and the third is the history of the Labs
6 open air testing at site 300. And I think all of
7 them add to the risk of radioactive or germ
8 contamination of our soils, our air, our water, our
9 food and our bodies.

10 Complex Transformation is a remake of
11 the complex 2030 which was defeated by congress so
12 our congressmen do not necessarily support this and
13 the DOE is disregarding the congress vote and
14 replacing warheads in the new complex renamed
15 complex plan.

16 Since the bombing of Hiroshima, WILPF,
17 Women Internation League For Peace and Freedom have
18 always emphasized the abolishen of nuclear weapons.
19 We believed that at one time the United States was
20 committed to global elimination of nuclear weapons
21 and that we were beginning to be in compliance with
22 our obligation to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation
23 Treaty and the world court ruling that the use of
24 nuclear weapons in the world is illegal but that
25 changed with the new administration and the 2002

1 nuclear posture review the current administration
2 has abandoned all efforts to abolish nuclear
3 weapons and instead has resumed testing and
4 developing new types.

5 The problem with nuclear weapons is the
6 radioactivity. The mining is polluting our ground
7 water. Transporting and exposing employees to
8 uranium and it does not make us safer. Selling
9 weapons to other countries does not make all of our
10 grandchildren safer.

11 MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds.

12 MS. BODDUM: So I wish to maybe just
13 move on down to finishing my talk which is the one
14 thing I haven't heard talked about and mentioned in
15 passing is new development of new weapons and I
16 wanted to say that I think a lot of people in this
17 community are not aware of the Biolab that was
18 placed here and the irresponsibility about it being
19 put in place without an environmental impact. And
20 the idea that we are even involved in germ warfare
21 at a secret lab.

22 WILPF does not support doing research or
23 developing bio weapons without having a independent
24 testing or examination or inspection of those labs.
25 This lab was just put into place and I have fears

1 for our community living downwind of Livermore Lab.

2 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Again, just to
3 remind you, if you have longer written comments and
4 you would like to have them put into the record,
5 you can leave them with me. The next speaker is
6 Dale Nesbitt to be followed by Phyllis Olin and
7 Marjorie Swann Edwin.

8 MR. NESBITT: Thank you. I remember
9 very well that day in August of 1945 when I first
10 learned about the atomic weapons that had been
11 dropped on Japan. I thought it was a great idea,
12 partly because I have two older brothers who were
13 all staged to take part in an invasion of Japan,
14 one in the infantry in the Philippines, one on a
15 mine sweeper. I went on after that, well, let me
16 say now, where do I stand now, some 60 plus years
17 later at age 76 -- I was 13 at that time.

18 I am now firmly believe that we need to
19 abolish all nuclear weapons from every country.
20 How did I get from where I was in 1945 to here? I
21 don't have much time to explain it, but I have some
22 unusual circumstances. My older brother who was on
23 a mine sweeper ended up being responsible for all
24 technical aspects of the liquid waste problems at
25 Hanford. That is one place that I started learning

1 about how horrible that problem was.

2 Another way is that I joined Lawrence
3 Berkeley Laboratory, not Livermore in the early
4 70's. I had the privilege of working with two
5 different physicists that worked on the Manhattan
6 project, one in particular the longest with
7 Dr. Owen Chamberlin, a Nobel laureate. He was a
8 principal engineer on a big subatomic particle
9 detector -- I was part of it, I was the principal
10 engineer. We worked directly together for five
11 years. I learned a lot about it from him. I had
12 already been thinking this way. We also had a
13 study group at Lawrence Berkeley Lab, where we
14 studied in detail all aspects of the problem and
15 from that is how I drew to my conclusions.

16 Now, let me jump to the EIS that is
17 under consideration. I understand very well how
18 rigged the system is, that we can't get up here and
19 rant and rave against the whole policy because that
20 isn't covered by the EPS. Now, that is true that
21 that is congress and the President's
22 responsibility, but nonetheless, unrestricted EPS,
23 there is three items which would make it -- the
24 only logical conclusion is to say, to recommend
25 that all research, development and design of

1 nuclear weapons be stopped.

2 The first is just simply, I think that
3 it is absolutely insane to even think that we can
4 spend 140 billion dollars designing, developing new
5 weapons facility and all this and then we tell
6 other countries: If you even dare think -- not
7 do -- even think about developing nuclear weapons,
8 we are going to invade you or bomb you to hell back
9 to the stone age. That is what happened in Iraq.
10 I was damned well convinced, I think the evidence
11 was clear that they had no nuclear weapons program.
12 They had no weapons of mass destruction and we
13 invaded Iraq.

14 What are we doing about Iran now?

15 Even our intelligence departments say
16 that they have no weapons program, yet it is most
17 likely that we will.

18 Okay. Another point that is just as
19 valid and that is that the money that is spent, if
20 you want to talk about environmental impact
21 statement, 140 billion dollars spent on weapons
22 program produced nothing except possible
23 destruction of all life on this earth. If that 140
24 billion dollars was spent instead on improving
25 energy efficiency, alternative energy they would

1 have a very positive effect on the environment.

2 The third is the waste program. Others
3 have detailed it so I won't say more. I thank you.

4 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Phyllis
5 Olin and she will be followed by Marjorie Swann
6 Edwin and Stephen Swiss.

7 MS. OLIN: Thank you very much. I am
8 Phyllis Olin. I am President of Western States
9 Legal Foundation and an attorney.

10 I just wanted to comment about the film
11 that we saw and I want to misquote a popular old
12 song. "You say nuclear, I say nuclear, let's call
13 the whole thing off."

14 As Dale mentioned, we are not supposed
15 to address policy, but of course, if you don't
16 address policy, you aren't talking about anything
17 worth talking about. The policy is flawed. There
18 were 32,000 comments in the last series of hearings
19 on the nuclear weapons facilities and they were
20 discounted, according to the summary of this PEIS
21 because they were about policy but the people
22 working at the LAB are only following policy, that
23 is a time-honored excuse. I understand they have
24 their lives, but the policy is what has to be
25 addressed.

1 Let's not be fooled. There is an
2 ongoing program to rebuild, to continue and to
3 extent nuclear weapons. The EIS, for what is now
4 called complex transformation, this is really the
5 latest label for ongoing work of rebuilding nuclear
6 weapons research facilities, manufacturing plants,
7 worn out and heavily contaminated since World War
8 II and the purpose is to retain US dominance in
9 nuclear weapons for many decades to come. The goal
10 is a 2002 Air Force planning document put it is to
11 prepare the US for a uncertain future by
12 maintaining US qualitative superiority in nuclear
13 war fighting capabilities in the 2020 to the 2040
14 time frame.

15 The United States is the only country
16 that has ever dropped a nuclear bombs, two on
17 Hiroshima and Nagasaki at the end of World War II.

18 And yet our policy, and it is becoming
19 more and more apparent, it is more and more stated,
20 is as the Air Force strategic planning director for
21 fiscal years 2006 to 2020 remained clear, nuclear
22 weapons provide a credible deterrent umbrella under
23 which conventional forces operate and if deterrents
24 fail strike a wide variety of high value targets
25 with a highly reliable responsive and lethal

1 nuclear force. That is our plan. We are not
2 making any bones about it, we plan to drop nuclear
3 bombs. That is part of our strategy. That is not
4 war fighting, that is Omnicide. And you know, I
5 have been struck since I have been here looking
6 around the room and myself, looking at myself, too,
7 it looks like we are at a wake. We are at a wake
8 for the human species and for life on this planet
9 and it is very disturbing to me. I was at one of
10 these hearings several years ago and the tone was a
11 lot different. I think it has become more and more
12 of a dire situation.

13 MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

14 MS. OLIN: We have to follow the NPT
15 mandate. We have to stop nuclear weapons in their
16 tracks. We have to abolish them. That is the only
17 way that the human species will survive. We can't
18 expect other countries not to want to be nuclear --
19 not to want to have nuclear weapons when that is
20 what we are doing. We have to stop it so they'll
21 stop it and now non-proliferation is a joke because
22 we will not behave like the adults we are supposed
23 to be and stop doing this. So I am going to end it
24 there. I don't think I can say anything more
25 important than that. Thank you very much.

1 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next
2 speaker will Marjorie Swann Edwin to be followed by
3 Stephen Swiss and Liz Chamberlin.

4 MS. EDWIN: Good afternoon. I am 87
5 years old and I spent 72 years of my life working
6 for justice and peace and let me assure you, those
7 of you who work at the LAB or are involved in other
8 such enterprises, that those of us who are speaking
9 here today and who work for justice and peace, we
10 do have alternatives to nuclear weapons, to
11 biological weapons for solving international
12 disputes and we have alternatives to war that have
13 worked, if we just give them a chance. I want to
14 just mention that in my opinion, the name National
15 Nuclear Security Administration is a misnomer. In
16 my opinion, nuclear and security don't belong
17 together in the same expression, as long as the
18 world has nuclear weapons, there is no security for
19 humanity, for other life species or for the
20 environment, so I wish you would change your name.

21 The handout that we were given, the very
22 last sentence on Page 23 says: Continue
23 accelerated dismantlement of weapons. I would hope
24 that that could be the first statement on all of
25 your goals and your Complex Transformation and add

1 to that -- and produce no more nuclear weapons, no
2 more. I say that for three reasons, as has been
3 mentioned a couple of times, the United States is
4 the only country in the world that has used nuclear
5 weapons and it continues to use them -- the
6 depleted uranium bombs used in Serbia, Kosovo, the
7 first Gulf War and now in Iraq are nuclear weapons
8 and they are damaging people from tiny babies to
9 elderly people and they are damaging not only the
10 Iraqis but people in that whole area, including our
11 own troops, so we are the only country that has
12 used this terrible weapon.

13 MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds.

14 MS. EDWIN: Yes. I would just like to
15 speak to those of you, Mr. Wyka and others, who do
16 work on these weapons. I would like to appeal to
17 your consciences to really think, to pray about the
18 work that you would do and to think about the
19 alternatives that the brain power and efforts that
20 you put in and the money that is put into these
21 systems could be used for very different purposes
22 and more constructive purposes in this world. I
23 want to say one more thing: I have been to
24 Hiroshima and Nagasaki. I know what the lasting
25 effects, even onto the second, the third or fourth

1 generations of nuclear weapons are. We do not want
2 to impose that any longer on the human race and on
3 the environment. Thank you.

4 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next
5 speaker is Stephen Swiss to be followed by Liz
6 Chamberlin and Don Larkin.

7 MR. SWISS: Hi, my name is Steve Swiss.
8 I work at Peace Action West. I want to address two
9 issues. First, the policy. The weapons that we
10 are going to be putting back on these ballistic
11 missiles are more usable quote-unquote. Variable
12 yield. They can go down to five kilotons. They
13 are for battle use. Every time the pentagon revs
14 up their super computers and does war games, every
15 time they introduce battlefield weapons into the
16 theater they ratchet it up within two a day into
17 all out nuclear war. What kind of madness is this?

18 What we need is a simple transformation,
19 keep a plant open to dismantle the work with
20 Russians, stop ratcheting up the cold war,
21 again. Get rid of them. As for the Kissinger-Nunn
22 plan. The second thing I would like to address is
23 the issue of safety. Safe nuclear weapons. That
24 is at a oxymoron. Let's go to Hanford. 586 square
25 files. They dumped 450 billion gallons of

1 plutonium waste sludge into unlined trenches. They
2 will never clean it up.

3 586 square miles. It is going into the
4 Columbia River.

5 Let's talk about Rocky Flats. Rocky
6 Flats had two fires, 110 kilograms of plutonium
7 burned. Mothers rocking their babies, taking them
8 out in strollers. When, in LA, when the smog gets
9 bad they tell you have to stay inside. The
10 government didn't tell anybody to stay inside.
11 When you let little children suck little pieces of
12 plutonium into their lungs and they die it is
13 called murder. Murder.

14 When you knowingly irradiate people,
15 when you know that radiation, we have known it
16 since Madame Curie died, it is deadly, and you
17 expose people to radiation, it is called murder.
18 In a court of law in the United States or anywhere
19 in the world it is called first degree murder.

20 MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Liz
21 Chamberlin then Don Larkin and Thad Binkley.

22 MS. CHAMBERLIN: Hi, I wasn't going to
23 speak but since I drove two hours to get here I
24 just wanted to register my opposition to
25 modernizing nuclear weapons and I think we need to

1 modernize our hearts and minds and imagine a world
2 without them and our country needs to lead the
3 world in abolishing nuclear weapons. Thank you.

4 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next
5 speaker is Donald Larkin and Thad Binkley and
6 Phyllis Jardine.

7 MR. LARKIN: Honor both article 6's, the
8 NPT, The Non-Proliferation Treaty and the US
9 Constitution. Article Six of The Non-Proliferation
10 Treaty obligates the United States to achieve total
11 world wide abolishment of nuclear weapons. Article
12 Six of the constitution says that treaty is the
13 supreme law of the land and as the supreme law of
14 the land it is more controlling or should be more
15 controlling of what you do than the nuclear posture
16 review or any policy of any administration, follow
17 the law.

18 Now there are a number of reasons why we
19 demand the abolishment of nuclear weapons and the
20 dismantling of the Nuclear Weapons Complex but
21 today is the fifth anniversary of the invasion of
22 Iraq. So perhaps it is appropriate to cite some
23 reasons associated with conventional war that is,
24 this Nuclear Weapons Complex your enterprises
25 contribution to conventional war, so I will cite

1 six contributions that you have made.

2 First, one, the development of nuclear
3 weapons was the first national security endeavor
4 that was both so dangerous and so high tech that it
5 could not be entrusted or explained to the people
6 of this country. It had to be put in the hands of
7 an elite cadre of experts who would make decisions
8 for us and act in our name but keep vital
9 information from us.

10 It thus became, your enterprise thus
11 became the model for the national security state
12 that we now have. It is a model that has
13 undermined our democracy by putting control in the
14 hands of a few and taking away from the majority of
15 the people. Could an administration such as our
16 current one keep as many things secret or declare
17 itself the only authority to make national security
18 decisions or to take us into a war that most people
19 oppose without your pioneering efforts in this
20 regard? I doubt it.

21 Two, the terrible weapons you produce
22 provide a cover that makes it easier for the
23 United States to go to war. Knowing that they have
24 a nuclear arsenal in their back pocket, political
25 leaders can take edgier and more aggressive stances

1 they otherwise would. They can threaten war and
2 rely upon military action with seeming impunity.

3 So, where there once would have been a
4 incentive to negotiate, there is a predisposition
5 to bully and to fight. Far from keeping the peace,
6 nuclear weapons reduce the barriers to so called
7 conventional war and we have seen this recently
8 with Iraq and another wars.

9 Three, you also taught us that massive
10 indiscriminate slaughter of civilians including
11 children and the aged was okay, it could be
12 justified. It could be sold to the people of this
13 country as necessary collateral damage. To accept
14 the Hiroshima bombing as anything but a war crime
15 is necessary to also accept the mass slaughter of
16 innocence as a legitimate military necessity.

17 We see now how this plays out, this
18 acceptance plays out in modern wars where civilian
19 casualties far out number military casualties. In
20 Iraq and Afghanistan the rules of engagement in
21 military tactics such as the air war, bombing,
22 striking neighborhoods and towns from the air
23 produce enormous numbers of civilian deaths and
24 injuries. Deaths and injuries that we don't like
25 to think about, but that we nonetheless accept with

1 equanimity. Congratulations. This acceptance was
2 pioneered by the nuclear weapons establishment.

3 Four, you introduce us to existential
4 fear. The fear that mankind could destroy itself
5 and perhaps all of life. Of course, we now
6 experience that fear with other forms of
7 environmental destruction, but you were the first.
8 And fear remains one of your primary products. The
9 fear that your products generate has been very
10 useful for getting us into wars.

11 Would there have been enough political
12 support for Iraq war without the express
13 declaration that it was necessary to prevent a
14 mushroom cloud over an American city.

15 Can Iraq and Iran be sold to the
16 American people without the fear that the Iranians
17 might be trying to get a nuclear weapon to use
18 against us? Not a chance. Fear, your contribution
19 to this world was essential.

20 Five, you know that all technology
21 proliferates and especially weapons technology, you
22 do the hard expensive work that others can follow
23 more cheaply and easily than you. You are the
24 engine of proliferation. Everything that you
25 invent will one day, in the not too distant future,

1 be in the hands of people you consider your
2 enemies. You also keep proliferation a live by
3 example. If it is okay for the United States to
4 upgrade its Nuclear Weapons Complex, why isn't okay
5 for others to have nuclear weapons and if the
6 United States has them and is behaving aggressively
7 in the world, why shouldn't other countries get
8 them to both emulate us and to deter us.

9 Since preventing the proliferation of
10 nuclear weapons is the main selling point for
11 getting this country into war as we saw in Iraq and
12 are seeing again with regard to Iran, what you do
13 to keep proliferation alive is an immeasurable
14 contribution to the war monger and getting this
15 country into war. You can be proud of that.

16 Six --

17 MR. LAWSON: We will move to move along.
18 Can you be brief?

19 MR. LARKIN: I will skip six but the
20 ending line is you are not making us safer, you are
21 not preventing war, you are facilitating war even
22 conventional war, the only safety is in world wide
23 abolition.

24 MR. LAWSON: I just have to apologize.
25 I am in the middle a situation where we have a

1 number of people going to speak. From the
2 beginning I told you to hold your comments to 3
3 minutes, when I said 30 second it would be nice to
4 stay within that. I know it is unfair. I really
5 understand it is unfair. But it is also unfair to
6 the people who have signed up to speak today to
7 have to wait until well over the time that we are
8 going to close the hearing. I am going to open the
9 hearing, it is 3:00 o'clock. I will go another 45
10 minutes. I have about 18 people. If we take them
11 at three minutes a piece, each, we will finish at
12 3:45. I hope we can follow that.

13 Our next speaker is Thad Binkley and
14 Phyllis Jardine and Eugene Ruyle.

15 MR. BINKLEY: My name is Than Binkley.
16 I am a Pleasanton resident and a Bay Area resident
17 all my life. I am affiliated with
18 Tri-Valley CARES. I am concerned about the
19 Department of Energy's complex transformation, aka,
20 complex 2030, aka Bombplex.

21 This transformation concerns me and many
22 other Bay Area residence including those in the
23 greater Bay Area and beyond not just the Tri-Valley
24 area.

25 When the Livermore Lab was founded the

1 nearby residents consisted mainly of cattle and
2 wildlife and the population of the valley was
3 concentrated a considerable distance from the LAB.

4 Nowadays the LAB is surrounded by
5 housing concentrated adjacent to its borders. When
6 the LAB was founded it was known as the Livermore
7 Radiation Laboratory or the Rad Lab. Nowadays it
8 is called the Lawrence Livermore Laboratory. Did
9 the Livermore Lab stop radiating all of a sudden?
10 No, it hasn't. There are documented instances of
11 radioactive materials escaping from the Lab's
12 confines. There are workers at the LAB who has
13 become ill from working with the materials at the
14 LAB. These incidents and these workers' illnesses
15 are well documented although not in the evening TV
16 news programs and only marginally in the
17 newspapers.

18 Another major item of concern is the
19 location of the Lab on an active earthquake fault,
20 the Greenville fault. There have been earthquakes
21 along this fault during the last few years and
22 there is no guarantee that the radioactive
23 materials within the Lab could be contained when a
24 major earthquake or series of earthquakes or both
25 occurs along that fault.

1 Still another item of concern is the
2 Complex Transformation is rebuilding the nation's
3 nuclear weapons production capabilities. As a
4 nation we should be doing just the opposite and
5 adhering to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty
6 reducing the number of nuclear weapons instead of
7 adding to them. What kind of message are we
8 sending to the nuclear capable nations of the world
9 by increasing our weapons production instead of
10 decreasing them as provided in the treaty? This
11 treaty is the law of the land per the United States
12 constitution. Let's transform that transformation.
13 Let's transform the Lab by completely removing the
14 quantities of radioactive material at the Lab and
15 not adding to them as proposed in the reliable
16 replacement warhead program. This could be done by
17 2010 instead of 2012 as claimed.

18 Let's transform the LAB by promoting
19 curatorship which surveys and tests non-nuclearly,
20 if I can makeup a word, the existing stockpile for
21 degradation and does not increase it and lets
22 transform the LAB by making it a center of research
23 on solutions to global warming, alternative fuels
24 and reduced energy dependence.

25 Thank you.

1 MR. LAWSON: I thank you. The next
2 speaker Phyllis Jardine, Eugene Ruyle and David
3 Carroll.

4 MS. JARDINE: My name is Phyllis
5 Jardine. I have lived in Pleasanton since the
6 1960's, I am a member of Tri-Valley CARES.
7 Franklin Delano Roosevelt once said that the only
8 thing that we have to fear is fear itself. These
9 words should resound now. We should examine what
10 we fear, where it has led us, where it is leading
11 us now. In earlier years, it was communism,
12 Russia, now it is terrorism. We built an enormous
13 arsenal of weapons and are still urged, largely by
14 the administration, aided by the national media
15 towards fear in building more and better weapons.
16 We are going in the wrong direction.

17 The nuclear weapons we have devised are
18 causing problems including pollution, sickness
19 among workers and exorbitant expenses, they did not
20 prevent 911, they have not prevented the near 4,000
21 deaths of the armed forces in Iraq.

22 One of the greatest fears we should have
23 now is proliferation of these weapons. If we
24 continue to build more and more weapons and make
25 new treaties, how can we expect other nations to do

1 anything but the same.

2 Our vision should be to work toward
3 fewer or no nuclear weapons and convert the LAB to
4 peaceful research uses and comply with The
5 Non-Proliferation Treaty.

6 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Eugene Ruyle,
7 David Carroll, David Mertes.

8 MR. RUYLE: Thank you. My name is
9 Eugene Ruyle, my friends call me "Cool Ruyle" and I
10 am an Americans professor of anthropology at Cal
11 State Long Beach. I am also the Peace and Freedom
12 Party candidate for congress in the tenth
13 congressional district which includes Livermore.
14 And one of the primary reasons for my congressional
15 campaign is to oppose nuclear weapons in any form,
16 nuclear weapons were obsolete the day they were
17 invented, most Americans understand this and
18 support nuclear disarmament.

19 Rather than embarking on a caustic
20 program of unnecessary and unwanted nuclear
21 weapons, the United States should honor the Nuclear
22 Non-Proliferation Treaty as a number of speakers
23 have suggested.

24 Such a program of nuclear and general
25 disarmament with free resources to address social

1 and environmental concerns. As former President
2 Dwight D. Eisenhower put it, every gun that is
3 made, every warship launched, every rocket fired
4 signifies in a final sense a theft from those who
5 hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and are
6 not clothed. This world in arms is spending not
7 money alone, it is spending the sweat of its
8 laborers, the genius of it's scientists, the hopes
9 of its children.

10 I hope the complex transformation SPEIS
11 will carefully analyze the benefits associated with
12 this alternative, that of complete nuclear
13 disarmament. Thank you.

14 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Our next
15 speaker is David Carroll and David Mertes and then
16 Michael Sarabia.

17 MR. CARROLL: My name is David Carroll.
18 I have been with Peace Action for a year and one
19 thing that has not been touched upon much is
20 people. People are the ones that are affected by
21 these weapons and people are the ones that are
22 killed by the weapons. And people are the ones
23 that are pushing these buttons. There was an
24 infamous experiment done at Stanford in the '70's
25 by Professor Philip Stombardo called the Stanford

1 Prison Experiment.

2 In this he found, given any opportunity,
3 people generally do the worse things you can
4 possibly imagine, things that we saw in Abu Gray
5 were documented in this prison study in just a
6 matter of days.

7 In light of this innate fact of human
8 nature, I think it is ridiculous to put into the
9 hands of any person, organization composed of
10 people, the ability to put a complete end to life
11 on earth as we know it and everyone remembers that
12 Carthage was destroyed and assaulted, do we really
13 want to be the civilization that assaulted the
14 world. That is it. Thank you.

15 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. All right.
16 David Mertes, M-e-r-t-e-s, is it? No. Followed by
17 Mark Smith and Ed Clark.

18 MR. SARABIA: Thank you very much
19 courageous and strong people that are still here.
20 Thank you very much. Since I tend to speak too
21 long, I will begin with the conclusion and
22 hopefully you will stay awake.

23 I may convince you, which I will try,
24 that those two conclusions are right.

25 The two conclusions are, one: The worst

1 thing we could possibly do is to shutdown Livermore
2 activities. That is even worse than firing ten
3 thousand teachers like they are about to do.

4 The other conclusion is that I think
5 that these reports should be rejected, should be
6 redone and we should meet again to evaluate the
7 second version.

8 Let me give you now the backup materials
9 and some details on that.

10 I was a Vietnam veteran and also a
11 security officer. And the one thing that you heard
12 mentioned around here and I learned in duty is
13 security and security is people, people here and
14 people there. It is the key to security.

15 If we were to shutdown Livermore --
16 well, let me tell you just two little important
17 stories: One, one individual who got degrees in
18 contact, he was deported to China, became head of
19 the missiles program over there and they recently
20 launched an orbiting satellite to the moon. One
21 person trained here developed all that there.

22 Another person, and this is a second
23 story, one person is allegedly, from reports, the
24 source of all the nuclear technology in Pakistan;
25 North Korea and Iran. So we have to take care of

1 the people in Livermore and provide them a repath
2 from where they are -- another force, and put them
3 out of work. That is not safe, it is not security.

4 For security reasons, we should develop
5 a energy programs that are green, healthy for the
6 future and a path for these brilliant people to
7 move to help in the solution, for example,
8 Pennsylvania lost a bridge. What could Livermore
9 have done about analyzing that bridge? They found
10 out that a river or two were a flow. Well, there
11 is technology that I studied and other people have,
12 they know a lot more from here, that those failure
13 analysis, find its weakest point, reinforce it,
14 measure it, keep track of it, all of these things
15 could have been recommended before the ridge was
16 constructed.

17 MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds.

18 MR. SARABIA: Finally, as to the
19 Pennsylvania thing, they changed the California --
20 they checked the California bridges and found 100
21 that are unacceptable and I guess analyze this.
22 Thank you.

23 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Mark Smith
24 and Ed Clark and Phil Adams.

25 MR. SMITH: I represent the Americans

1 who haven't heard about Complex Transformation and
2 haven't had a chance to come here because our
3 country's media is so corporatized and it sucks. I
4 have been diagnosed with a condition, this is
5 called common sense, some have it, some of us
6 don't.

7 Common sense that our arsenal is
8 outdated and the fact that we don't need it
9 anymore, it is kind of like a rotten moldy apple.
10 I don't know why we are wanting to buy more of
11 these rotten moldy apples. Can't we just throw
12 them all away and actually buy things and invest in
13 things that are going to feed humanity rather than
14 starve us?

15 Oh, yeah, a side note moldy apples,
16 eating these may cause hallucinations that nuclear
17 weapons are safe. Be careful.

18 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Ed Clark, Phil
19 Adams and Dan Voth.

20 MR. CLARK: My name is Edward Clark. I
21 am a retired physician in Livermore. I was Chief
22 of Staff at Valley Memorial Hospital and cocreator
23 of the bioethics committee there. I am currently
24 on the Institutional Review Board the IRB of the
25 Lawrence Livermore National Lab whose role it is to

1 ensure that human research subjects are not coerced
2 into participating that they have had a well
3 understood informed consent and that they have the
4 opportunity to withdraw from a study at any time
5 without penalty and their privacy is protected at
6 all times.

7 The IRB has epitomized the Belmont
8 reports basic ethical principles of respect for
9 persons, and justice. It has been in those roles
10 that I have been able to observe the relationship
11 of the laboratory in the community. They have
12 taken great care in disaster planning and in
13 protection of vulnerable populations in human
14 research projects. In a perfect world there would
15 be no risk or error in human behavior, since this
16 is not a perfect world, and there is a chance for
17 mistakes, every effort should be made to minimize
18 adverse effects and it is my opinion that the
19 Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory is making
20 that effort. The current plan that is being
21 proposed provides centers of excellence for nuclear
22 design and engineering in high explosive research
23 and development is needed to maintain national
24 security. Continuing the work for the national
25 emission facility to improve our knowledge of high

1 explosive applications and high energy density
2 physics without a negative environmental impact is
3 also imperative.

4 Thank you for allowing me to express my
5 opinions in support of the efforts of the National
6 Nuclear Security Administration to create a smaller
7 more secure and less expensive site. Thank you.

8 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. The next
9 speaker is Phil Adams. Mr. Adams will be followed
10 by Dan Voth and Stephen McNeil.

11 MR. ADAMS: Hi my name's Phil Adams. I
12 have only been around for a quarter of a century
13 but one thing that I have learned is that violence
14 only facilitates more violence. Our country is a
15 great country, however I feel our current path is
16 one that will lead to our eventual destruction.
17 The path we are on values money more than morals,
18 it values power more than the population and it
19 values weapons more than children.

20 In our country people are being
21 bankrupted by medical bills, our children's
22 education has fallen to the lowest priority but
23 certain people would still rather value nuclear
24 weapons and violence over the infrastructure that
25 makes us great.

1 There is no argument that plutonium is
2 hazardous, we all know that, but when it shows up
3 in drinking water in a children's park you have to
4 ask what do we need these weapons for and what will
5 we be defending if our children are gone?

6 The whole purpose behind Complex
7 Transformation and nuclear weapons is to deter
8 enemies from attacking us. It is mutually assured
9 destruction. That is the legacy we will leave
10 behind us, destruction, if we don't stop it now. I
11 believe the only way we can do this and end this
12 era of violence is true understanding and
13 compassion. Thanks.

14 MR. LAWSON: Dan Voth. Followed by
15 Stephen McNeil and William Nebo.

16 MR. VOTH: I will make this brief. Just
17 a few points of observation. Can you hear me?

18 Profit for the sake of profit is the
19 ideology of cancer cells and we are all parasites,
20 but the smart parasite learns not to kill its host.
21 Pure based decisions are ill conceived but seldom
22 fruitful. True patriots don't act.

23 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Stephen McNeil,
24 William Nebo and Peter Klotz-Chamberlin.

25 MR. McNEIL: I am Stephen McNeil with

1 Pacific Committee based here in Northern California
2 and American Friends Service Committee is a Quaker
3 organization which includes people of various
4 faiths who are committed to social justice, peace
5 and humanitarian service. No one person or group
6 speaks for the religious friends.

7 Today on the fifth anniversary of the
8 war in Iraq we are beginning to be aware of the
9 human costs of the war there and in Afghanistan,
10 over a trillion dollars to wage the war, nearly
11 4,000 US military deaths, several hundred thousand
12 Iraq deaths, perhaps as much as 600,000 or more.
13 Out of the one million US people who have served in
14 Iraq and Afghanistan, thousands are severally
15 wounded and suffering from their experiences and
16 will pay those costs the rest of their lives.

17 We have an infrastructure in Iraq and
18 the US that are weakened by all this, our own
19 response to hurricane Katrina and Rita.

20 Today I wish to speak on the basis of
21 these relationships of the buyers of atomic bombs
22 and those adversely affected by the past
23 development and testing of nuclear weapons, they
24 are in the room today.

25 Briefly, I would just like to say that

1 looking at the Complex Transformation proposals and
2 the Environmental Impact Statement, it is just
3 another way of modernizing the nuclear weapons and
4 expanding research and development for new nuclear
5 weapons. You have to look at what the acts are of
6 the administration and that is they are proposing
7 in the '09 budget, 30 million dollars for the
8 reliable replacement warhead and 100 million
9 dollars to begin construction on the nuclear pit
10 facility.

11 Making it brief, basically at a time
12 when we are pushing others to follow the spirit of
13 nuclear nonproliferation treaty, we must comply
14 with the treaties call for governments dismantle of
15 the nuclear weapons and infrastructures, so I guess
16 our preferred alternative is to oppose moving
17 forward with this proposal and to oppose any
18 congressional actions to funding, thank you.

19 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. This would be
20 William Nemo and then Peter Klotz-Chamberlin and
21 Donald King.

22 MR. NEMO: I am a retired pastor living
23 in Livermore since 1972 and at that time when I
24 moved here the Cold War was hot and the hot war in
25 Vietnam was still in its painful last stage.

1 As a resident in Livermore who actively
2 discussed the mission and work of the Laboratory
3 with fellow citizens and Lab employees I found here
4 a refreshing mix of learned and careful thinkers
5 pondering what to do about national security in a
6 nuclear age.

7 It was clear then as it is now that
8 nuclear weapons could not be uninvented but could
9 be managed. The management of that overall threat
10 these weapons bring to us and the world has allowed
11 us to live without a singular nuclear exchange
12 between combatants since Hiroshima and Nagasaki
13 awakened our consciousness some 64 years ago.

14 With the Cold War thankfully over it is
15 commendable that our laboratories are planning to
16 adjust to a world that is void of two super powers
17 basing their security on mutually assured
18 destruction, but the reality of nuclear weapons
19 still exists, the need to maintain a credible
20 defense, unfortunately, still does exist. I am
21 pleased to see this action taken to begin to shrink
22 our nuclear stockpile to reflect present political
23 realities. It would be well to accelerate the
24 efforts, but I suspect that this will extend into
25 the purview of the next administration. I would

1 hope this would continue and that we would work
2 responsibly to do this kind of accelerating of our
3 effort to shrink our nuclear stockpile.

4 I am very pleased to share our talented
5 efforts of our Lab to present our nation with a
6 credible defense. My experience with the LAB is an
7 experience of an organization dedicated to keeping
8 people around its facility safe from any hazards of
9 work done within its confines. I have spent over a
10 decade as a citizen, member of the institutional
11 review board examining all experimentation
12 involving human subjects. The painstakingly
13 careful of this board gave me a great deal of
14 confidence in the Lab's dedication safety. As a
15 member of the DOE's working group on human subjects
16 experimentations I was able to attend several of
17 the major conferences of all national I R B's and
18 it is satisfying to note the standard of care of
19 LLNL in this field is the very highest level in the
20 nation.

21 Now as the NNSA takes a greater role in
22 deciding what LLNL will be doing in the future of
23 another administration, I would voice a hope: To
24 have the entire vision of our national laboratories
25 overseen by an organ of national security means

1 that our key tax-supported venture into cutting
2 edge science is held in the grasp of our fear.

3 National security is, if nothing else, a
4 way we deal with our fear of external threat. It
5 is a valid fear but this fear ought not to define
6 in dealing totally with our science.

7 Science is best served when it is held
8 in the firm grasp of our hopes, our courageous
9 hopes, our wise plans for what we might become.
10 One finger of that grasp should be a legitimate
11 fear, but the other four should be our legitimate
12 dreams. I would hope that as we phase into another
13 administration, we will phase into a clearer
14 picture of what we can do with our science to both
15 tend the weapons we need and to build our tools of
16 hope for the future while seeking to understand the
17 universe that endures us. Thank you.

18 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir. Peter
19 Klotz-Chamberlin to be followed by Donald King.

20 MR. KLOTZ-CHAMBERLIN: My name is Peter
21 Klotz-Chamberlin. I am a member of the Resource
22 Center of Non-Violence and also First Congressional
23 Church in Santa Cruz. I will also say I am an
24 unwilling human subject in the experiment of
25 nuclear technology.

1 I find being here, as I appreciated the
2 conversation with Dr. George Allen, I find it
3 troubling to be here and one of those things, there
4 are several points about that, and one that hasn't
5 been mentioned is I wondered if this move now to
6 transform the Nuclear Weapons Complex is in part
7 because of the highly vulnerable status of our
8 nuclear technology and the fact it is vulnerable to
9 terrorism around the world.

10 I also will say that it is in fact a
11 part of terrorism. What is terrorism if it is not
12 targeting civilians. If it is not using fear as a
13 weapon as others eloquently stated. If it is not
14 using that unimaginable threat as a fundamental
15 element of American foreign policy to enforce our
16 power around the world.

17 We are not just pointing fingers between
18 the yes's and the no's here, we are all part of
19 this. My father worked momentarily at Oakridge as
20 the bombs were being developed for Nagasaki and
21 Hiroshima. My uncle worked at Los Alamos. I pay
22 taxes. This is all of us.

23 I've studied violence my whole life and
24 I recall in this conversation that I had with
25 Dr. Allen and the conversation I have had with many

1 people, the rationale is there are other bad actors
2 out there and we need to respond to them.

3 Well, I see that most violence is
4 justified by us being the victim. That is what
5 happened in Iraq. We had September 11 and then
6 we've killed so many more times numbers of people
7 in Iraq out of our sense of victimizations, we, the
8 greatest power on earth, feeling as the victim.
9 That's what happens with nuclear weapons. It is
10 always them, even though we are leading the
11 technology.

12 I believe in the insights and the
13 response and approach to violence of somebody like
14 Martin Luther King. Somebody like Jesus whom we
15 remember this Easter week. Their insights were
16 that we respond to violence by changing ourselves,
17 by not creating the violence, by not building a
18 huge weapons of mass destruction complex. And so
19 the only way to really transform it is to start
20 taking it down and that is something that we, that
21 is our work for us to cease and then we will lead
22 the world. Thank you.

23 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Donald King,
24 Jackie Cabasso and Toby Brink.

25 MR. KING: Donald King, I am a resident

1 of Livermore, and have been since 1978. I am a
2 member of Tri-Valley Communities Against A
3 Radioactive Environment, I am also a member of Fox
4 Christy, Peace of Christ, USA Livermore, recently
5 established here in Livermore.

6 I have two things I wanted to talk about
7 today. One was that a letter that I, well, I wrote
8 a letter to The Editor regarding Senator Diane
9 Feinstein's proposal to review our nuclear weapons
10 policy and that was credited in the Valley Times of
11 October 16, 2007 and I talked about the reliable
12 replacement warhead, I am not too sure exactly
13 where that program stands at the moment but in my
14 letter I said that that is a part of the new
15 Complex Transformation plan, maybe it is in doubt,
16 but nevertheless -- but, my main concern is the
17 policy of discerns. I wound up in that letter of
18 October 16th referencing Senator Feinstein's
19 proposal S1924.

20 That nuclear title -- titled Nuclear
21 Policy and Posture Review Act concerned citizens
22 should call Fienstein's office about this and work
23 to get the support of others in congress to get
24 this bill passed. We need a policy that does not
25 rely on threats to use a nuclear option.

1 Well, Senator Feinstein replied to me
2 and she seemed to focus basically on Reliable
3 Replacement Nuclear Warhead Program in a letter
4 dated November 28th, I just received it yesterday,
5 and I would like to quote from that letter.

6 She says, Dear Mr. King, I remain deeply
7 concerned about this administrations nuclear
8 weapons policy. For fiscal year 2008 the
9 administration is requesting 118 million dollars
10 for the Reliable Replacement Warhead Program, 88
11 million dollars in the National Nuclear Security
12 Administrations budget and 30 million dollars in
13 the Department of Defenses budget.

14 These funds would be used for the
15 development phase of the warhead design definition
16 and cost study.

17 Yet, the administration has failed to
18 make a case for providing additional funding to
19 what we all know will be a new nuclear weapon.

20 There is one paragraph, it may interest
21 you to know that I introduced the Nuclear Policy
22 and Posture Review Act of 2007, that is S 1914 on
23 August 1st, 2007. If enacted S 1914 would
24 eliminate the funding for the Reliable Warhead
25 Program for fiscal years 2008, 2009, and 2010 until

1 the President submits both a nuclear policy review
2 and nuclear posture review to congress.

3 MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

4 MR. KING: The other issue is the
5 National Ignition Facility. I don't see much in
6 here about that and yet it seems to me it is a part
7 of the stockpile program in the draft complex book.
8 It is mentioned on page S 26, Tritium Production
9 Research and Development.

10 Very limited tritium operations are
11 performed at LLNL in the tritium facility within
12 the super block primarily to support preparation of
13 tritium targets for the National Ignition Facility.

14 Tritium, in general, I think is
15 something we would like to get out of Livermore.

16 Then on the last page or almost the last
17 page, S 57 of this book, alternatives can certainly
18 be eliminated and under the heading of Pursuit
19 Dismantlement and Refrain From Designing and
20 Building New Nuclear Weapons, that was eliminated
21 there.

22 With respect to not designing or
23 building new nuclear weapons the SPEIS does not
24 propose to design or build new nuclear weapons.
25 Decision to design or build new nuclear weapons are

1 made by the President and the congress. While this
2 seems to be a concern by people like Senator Diane
3 Feinstein, myself and many others who are concerned
4 with the nuclear option threat. Thank you.

5 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, sir.

6 MS. CABASSO: My name is Jackie Cabasso
7 I am the executive director of the Western States
8 Legal Foundation in Oakland, a nuclear disarmament
9 advocacy group that has been monitoring this
10 facility and the Nuclear Weapons Complex for more
11 than 25 years.

12 Today marks the 5th anniversary of the
13 illegal US attack on Iraq. A war launched on
14 pretext of ending a nuclear weapons program that
15 did not exist.

16 Today we are at a public hearing in
17 Livermore on the United States Government's current
18 plan to modernize the very real laboratories and
19 factories where the US designs, build and maintains
20 nuclear weapons. We have found the weapons of mass
21 destruction. They are here. And complex
22 transformation, which really should be called
23 complex continuation represent nothing less than a
24 nuclear surge and we demand an end to this nuclear
25 surge.

1 Why? Among other reasons because it is
2 illegal. Article Six of the Nuclear
3 Non-Proliferation Treaty reads: Each of the
4 parties to this treaty undertakes to pursue
5 negotiations in good faith on effective measures
6 relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at
7 an early date and to nuclear disarmament.

8 That entered and deployed the binding US
9 domestic law in 1970 at an early date. In 1996 the
10 international court of justice unanimously found
11 that there exists an obligation to pursue in good
12 faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations
13 leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects
14 under strict and effective international control.

15 So I want to talk a little bit about the
16 concept of good faith embedded in Article Six and
17 the universal disarmament obligation unanimously
18 affirmed by International Court of Justice or ICJ.

19 For most people not lawyers the term
20 "good faith" may sound rather vague or poetic,
21 though its common sense meaning is clear but it has
22 a long history and a precise meaning in law. This
23 has been well explained by Judge Christopher
24 Weeramantry the former Vice President of the court,
25 who in 2006 remarks, marking the tenth anniversary

1 of the ICJ opinion explained that the traditions in
2 relation to good faith are to be found in the
3 ancient system of Roman law, the system of civil
4 law that has grown up from the Roman law and all
5 the traditional systems of law.

6 Judge Weeramantry identified some of the
7 legal elements of good faith as correspondence
8 between word and deed, no secret reservations,
9 openness and transparency with a complete
10 disclosure of material facts and a readiness to
11 submit one's actions to external scrutiny.

12 In addition, good faith requires that
13 meaningful steps be taken toward the desired goal
14 with no back tracking and within a reasonable time
15 span. He said, quote, "Everyone must refrain from
16 taking steps that militate against the goal." For
17 example, one cannot say that one's goal is
18 disarmament and then take steps to increase ones
19 armament in a somewhat subtle but different way.

20 Judge Weeramantry emphasized that there
21 must be cooperation among the parties, a continuity
22 of efforts, and an actual method worked out with
23 the readiness by the parties to keep reexamining
24 their own positions while seriously considering the
25 proposals of others.

1 Referring to the ICJ's affirmation of
2 the disarmament obligation he said quote: "The
3 ultimate authority on international law has
4 unanimously placed this verdict upon all the
5 nuclear powers of the world and we have to ask
6 whether all these ingredients of good faith are
7 being honored. If not, why are they not being
8 honored and in what way are they failing in their
9 responsibility."

10 MR. LAWSON: 30 seconds, please.

11 MS. CABASSO: Well, complex continuation
12 is a poster child for bad faith. The viability of
13 The Non-Proliferation Treaty regime is in jeopardy
14 in large part due to the lack of good faith
15 evidenced by the United States regarding compliance
16 with Article Six.

17 Instead of making timetables for
18 disarmament, the United States is making a
19 timetable for new nuclear weapons. When good faith
20 required that they should be making time tables for
21 the elimination of their nuclear arsenals in
22 compliance with Article Six.

23 I will just take 30 seconds to once
24 again advocate for another alternative. That
25 alternative is redefining security in human terms.

1 The concept of security should be refrained at
2 every level of society in government with a premium
3 on universal, human and ecological security, a
4 return to multilateralism and a commitment to
5 cooperative, nonviolent means of conflict
6 resolution.

7 The United States should make nuclear
8 disarmament the leading edge of a global trend
9 toward redirection of military expenditures to meet
10 human and environmental needs.

11 And just for your interest, what I was
12 reading you from was some excerpts from a speech
13 that I had the honor of delivering to the
14 United Nations first committee on behalf of
15 non-governmental organizations last October. Thank
16 you.

17 MR. LAWSON: The next speaker will be
18 Toby Brink followed by Jon Oldfather.

19 MR. BRINK: My name is Toby Brink and I
20 am a resident of Livermore, also President of
21 Tri-Valley Business Council, a business sponsored
22 public policy advocacies organization that
23 represents businesses in the greater Tri-Valley
24 region.

25 The Tri-Valley Business Counsel supports

1 the basic premise behind the Complex Transformation
2 Recommendation which is to provide safe, secure and
3 reliable nuclear warheads in support of nations
4 deterrents. A move from a nuclear complex designed
5 for the Cold War to the Twenty-First Century
6 enterprise.

7 There is a forefront of science and
8 technology and responsive to the future of national
9 security requirements.

10 Lastly, a smaller and safer and less
11 expensive enterprise that leverages the scientific
12 and technical capabilities of our work force to
13 meet our national security environments.

14 We support the recommendation of NNSA's
15 preferred alternative which includes the Center for
16 Excellence for Nuclear Engineering and Design,
17 Center for Excellence for High Explosives
18 Engineering, The Super Computing Capabilities, RND
19 and The National Ignition Facility.

20 Obviously, this discussion has taken a
21 very negative tone. I wanted to point out that
22 there are many positives contributions from the
23 Lawrence Livermore Lab to the community as well.
24 3,347 employee residents reside in the Tri-Valley
25 area and have contributed 2.4 million dollars to

1 the causes here in the Tri-Valley during their last
2 home campaign. The payroll base of 357 million
3 dollars contributes to the tax revenue of the
4 region.

5 In short, Lawrence Livermore contributes
6 to the quality of life and the economy in the
7 Tri-Valley through economic development,
8 philanthropy, employee involvement in the community
9 and leadership in the science and technology
10 research.

11 In conclusion, I would like to reiterate
12 my support for Lawrence Livermore Lab and the
13 recommendation by NNSA's preferred alternative for
14 the Lawrence Livermore National site. Thank you
15 for your time.

16 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next
17 speaker is Jon Oldfather.

18 MR. OLDFATHER: My name is John
19 Oldfather. I am here from San Anselmo, California.
20 I am representing the Social Justice Center for
21 Marin. Just as an aside, I wanted to say there is
22 nothing negative about opposing weapons of mass
23 destruction, I just wanted to get that across.

24 It seems ill advised and short sighted
25 to base the alternatives considered for the Nuclear

1 Weapons Complex on the Bush administration's
2 nuclear posture review. The position paper from a
3 politically bankrupt administration. After all,
4 this is supposed to be a long range plan. The
5 alternatives are narrow and most importantly, they
6 break the law.

7 Instead, how about basing alternatives
8 on existing US law like The Non-Proliferation
9 Treaty which as a US treaty is the highest law of
10 the land. Therefore, and knowing that planning is
11 all important, it would be prudent and the
12 administration would be irresponsible or even
13 negligent to not include alternatives based upon
14 this law which calls for a multilateral nuclear
15 disarmament.

16 Perhaps you could produce a plan on how
17 we can get there safely. Here are some
18 alternatives that would be good to be considered.
19 The US complies along with other nuclear weapons
20 states with a Non-Proliferation Treaty over various
21 time frames, say ten, twenty, thirty, fifty years.
22 What kind of facilities do we need then?

23 What additional research facilities and
24 physical facilities do we need to promote this
25 treaty's enforcement. How much would that cost?

1 Thank you.

2 MR. LAWSON: Last call for Sblend

3 Sblendorio. Is he coming? No? Okay.

4 Well, I have come to the end of my list
5 and it is 3:44. Congratulations. Thank you very
6 much for your participation today. We appreciate
7 the time that you've taken to make many thoughtful
8 comments. Again, I tell you that it is very
9 difficult for me to interrupt people who have given
10 a lot of thought and have written out a very
11 detailed statement of what they would like to say.
12 I know it is heart felt and I would hope that you
13 would either leave comments that you didn't get a
14 chance to say today with us or that you consider
15 finishing them and sending them into the DOE by the
16 closing of the public comment period which is April
17 10th.

18 We will reconvene this evening. I
19 believe open house starts at 6:00 o'clock. You are
20 certainly welcome to come back, and we will go
21 until 10:00 o'clock. I just want to thank, before
22 we leave, our Court Reporter for an excellent job,
23 thanking DOE and the staff who are at the displays
24 and all of you for coming.

25 Thank you very much and this hearing is

1 now recessed.

2

3 (Whereupon the early afternoon session

4 was adjourned.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
 2) ss.
 3 COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN)
 4
 5

6 I hereby certify that the public
 7 hearing was taken at the time and place therein
 8 named; that the comments of the said speakers was
 9 reported by me, a duly Certified Shorthand Reporter
 10 and disinterested person, and was thereafter
 11 transcribed into typewriting under my direction.

12
 13 WITNESS WHEREOF, I have
 hereunto subscribed my
 14 hand this 17th day of
 April, 2008

15
 16
 17 _____
 DENNIS M. SOUZA, CSR No. 3893

18
 19
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25