

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL
IMPACT STATEMENT

COMPLEX TRANSFORMATION

PUBLIC HEARING

TUESDAY
MARCH 25, 2008

The Public Hearing met in room
1E245 in the Forrestal Building, 1000
Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C.,
at 12:00 noon, Holmes Brown, Facilitator,
presiding.

PRESENT

HOLMES BROWN, Facilitator
TED WYKA, Hearing Officer
PATRICIA ANTON, Muslim-Christian Initiative
ELLEN BARFIELD, Women's International League

for Peace and Freedom
ROSEMARY BLANCHARD, Albuquerque Friends Peace
& Social Concern
KRISTA BREWER, Women's Action for New
Directions
CHRISTINA CERNANSKY, Women's Action for New
Directions

DAVID CULP, Friends Committee on National
Legislation
JONI EASTLEY, County of Nye
CATHERINE FUKES, Peace Action
CATHY GARGER
SUSAN GORDON, Alliance for Nuclear
Accountability

MARK GUBRUD
BILL HARTUNG, New America Foundation
KEVIN KAMPS, Beyond Nuclear

PRESENT (CONT.)

CINDY KELLY, Atomic Heritage Foundation
MARIE LUCEY, OSF, Leadership Conference of
Women Religious

GLEN MARA, Los Alamos National Laboratory
ALFRED MEYER, Alliance for Nuclear
Accountability

PAMELA MOFFAT, Episcopal Peace Fellowship
JUDITH MOHLING, Alliance for Nuclear
Accountability

TARA MORROW, Faithful Security

REVEREND JOSEPH NAGLE, Pax Christi
TIMOTHY O'CONNELL, Maryknoll Office for Global
Concerns

CHRISTOPHER PAINE, National Resources Defense
Council

JON RAINWATER, Peace Action West

NICK ROTH, Nuclear Age Peace Foundation

ELLEN THOMAS

JONATHAN VENTURA, Los Alamos National
Laboratory

ANISA VISJI, Muslim-Christian Initiative

CHERYL WERTZ, Peace Action New York State

STEPHEN YOUNG, Union of Concerned Scientist

EMILY ZAEBST

SERENITY ZAEBST

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

2 11:59 a.m.

3 MR. BROWN: If the folks will take
4 their seats, we'll get started with this
5 afternoon's meeting. Good afternoon. Welcome
6 to this public hearing of the National Nuclear
7 Security Administration's Supplemental
8 Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement,
9 or Supplemental PEIS for the transformation of
10 the nation's nuclear weapons complex. I hope
11 you had an opportunity to browse our displays
12 and talk with project staff during the just
13 completed open house.

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

1 participation by everyone. At the
2 registration table you should have received a
3 participant's package which contains
4 information on the transformation of the
5 nuclear weapons complex. If you didn't
6 receive a packet please raise your hand and
7 the staff can deliver one to you. Is anybody
8 missing? We've got about four.

9 If you can keep your hands up, a
10 little exercise here. There are two parts to
11 this hearing. The information segment, and
12 the formal comments segment. The information
13 segment began with the hour long open house
14 that has just concluded, and continues with an
15 eight minute welcome video from Mr. Robert
16 Smolen, Deputy Administrator for Defense
17 Programs.

18 It will be followed by a 20 minute
19 presentation by Mr. Ted Wyka, the Supplemental
20 PEIS document manager. Mr. Wyka will discuss
21 the Complex Transformation Project and the
22 contents of the Supplemental PEIS. The formal

1 comment segment will begin immediately after
2 Mr. Wyka's presentation. During the formal
3 comment segment, members of the public will
4 provide their views on the Supplemental PEIS.
5 The court reporter will transcribe a verbatim
6 record of your comments. Ted Wyka will be
7 present to hear your comments but will not be
8 responding to questions.

9 If you wish to make a comment and
10 have not yet signed up to do so, you may add
11 your list to the name at the registration
12 table out front. We now continue the
13 information segment with a video by Mr. Robert
14 Smolen, Deputy Administrator for Defense
15 Programs of the Department of Energy.

16 MR. BROWN: It is now time to
17 receive your formal comments on the proposed
18 Supplemental PEIS. This is your opportunity
19 to give DOE your views on the draft document.
20 The court reporter is ready to transcribe your
21 statement. Let me review a few ground rules
22 for the comment period. Now please step up to

1 the microphone over there. When your name is
2 called, introduce yourself providing an
3 organizational affiliation where appropriate.

4 If you have a written verse, maybe
5 your statement, please give it to the court
6 reporter after you've completed your remarks.
7 I will call two names at a time. The first of
8 the speaker, the second of the person to
9 follow. In view of the number of people who
10 signed up to make public statements this
11 afternoon, please confine your remarks to five
12 minutes. I will let you know when you have a
13 minute remaining.

14 Ted Wyka will be serving as the
15 hearing officer as the Department of Energy
16 during the formal comment period. So that by
17 way of introduction, let me call the first
18 speaker. Ellen Barfield will start and Joni
19 Eastley will be second.

20 MS. BARFIELD: Thank you, Mr.
21 Brown. Thank you friends and colleagues. I
22 am Ellen Barfield with the Women's

1 International League for Peace and Freedom.
2 Speaking for that organization although I work
3 with many. The current SPEIS for the so-
4 called Complex Transformation presented by the
5 Department of Energy outlines plans very
6 similar to those for Complex 2030 which has
7 already been rejected by the US Congress.

8 These plans, if allowed to go
9 forward, would not only seriously endanger our
10 environment, they would lead to further global
11 destabilization and insecurity. They defy the
12 World Court ruling on the illegality of use or
13 a threat of use of nuclear weapons. And defy
14 as well the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty
15 which our government has ratified, and which
16 under our Constitution, is part of the supreme
17 law of our land. We want to thank and commend
18 all those individuals and organizations
19 calling for a no production alternative to
20 this current SPEIS for Complex Transformation.

21 We maintain that producing no more
22 nuclear weapons is the only alternative open

1 to the US. If our nation is to support human
2 rights, human security, democracy, and the
3 rule of law over the rule of brute force in
4 our own nation and in the world, thrust to the
5 environment alone, however, make the plans
6 outlined in Complex Transformation untenable.
7 These plans rely upon implementation of the
8 Global Nuclear Energy partnership which itself
9 would lead to environmental disaster as
10 outlined in the report of Robert Alvarez,
11 Senior Policy Advisor to the US Secretary of
12 Energy from 1993 to 1999.

13 That report concludes that the
14 GNEP is likely to squander billions in tax
15 payer dollars on an unproven reprocessing
16 technology that will generate unprecedented
17 and unmanageable amounts of highly radioactive
18 wastes without a plausible disposition pads.

19 The DOE is already failing to meet
20 mandated goals for clean up of nuclear waste
21 sites which endanger our rivers, our soil, and
22 the lives of our citizens. Now a Complex

1 Transformation would bring still more nuclear
2 wastes to already dangerously toxic disposal
3 sites, and it even includes unacceptable plans
4 for transporting radioactive waste from site
5 to site across our nation. In addition,
6 redevelopment of the nuclear weapons complex
7 will adversely affect the environment and the
8 lives of Native Americans whose lands are
9 widely used despite their protests for
10 radioactive waste storage, uranium mining,
11 nuclear weapons development, and for testing
12 of ICBMs and other nuclear weapon's delivery
13 vehicles.

14 And of course, the ultimate danger
15 to the environment rests in the stated intent
16 of those who are promoting Complex
17 Transformation to actually use nuclear weapons
18 in future wars for dominance and resources.
19 We, of the Women's International League for
20 Peace and Freedom, would like to augment the
21 no-production alternative by outlining what
22 should be our steps to fulfilling the promise

1 of abolition of nuclear weapons in the
2 nonproliferation treaty. We as women know the
3 preciousness of every human life and of our
4 planet Earth. We are convinced that
5 fulfillment of the promise of abolition is the
6 true alternative to complex transformation and
7 the best hope for our own future and the
8 future of our decedents for all generations to
9 come.

10 MR. BROWN: You have a minute.

11 MS. BARFIELD: Thank you. I don't
12 need the full five minutes. I was expecting
13 to have three. I will be turning in the
14 longer document which elaborates on the 13
15 steps which have been put out as to how to get
16 to abolition nuclear weapons.

17 MR. BROWN: Okay. Thanks very
18 much. Okay. Joni Eastley is next, and Cathy
19 Garger will follow.

20 MS. EASTLEY: I am Joni Eastley.
21 I am chairman of the Nye County, Nevada Board
22 of Commissioner's. I represent Nye County

1 District II in which lies the town of Tonopah,
2 and the Tonopah Test Range. 97 percent of Nye
3 County lands are subject to federal agency
4 controls most of which are the Nevada Testing
5 Training Range, home of NNSA's Tonopah Test
6 Range Facilities, and the Nevada test site.

7 Both have had a significant impact
8 on our economy. We have, for example, been
9 subject to several federally induced boom and
10 bust cycles. Nye County will be submitting
11 formal written comments on the Complex
12 Transformation. My remarks today will update
13 those that I provided at the Tonopah and Las
14 Vegas hearings, and summarize our county's
15 position on this proposed action.

16 Specifically, I would like to address the
17 proposed relocation of NNSA flight test
18 operations.

19 Our county has served the nation's
20 defense needs at every turn. We were home to
21 aircraft or air crew training in World War II.
22 Nuclear weapons testing since the 1950s. We

1 were considered as the home for MX. We have
2 been host to the stealth fighter program when
3 it was classified, and we are the designated
4 site for the nation's geologic repository for
5 nuclear waste.

6 We have yet to shy away from doing
7 our patriotic duty. We are glad to do it.
8 All that we have ever asked for in return is
9 that we be treated with fairness and respect.
10 We appreciated that the multifaceted complex
11 transformation was made as simple as possible
12 in the draft Complex Transformation, PEIS.
13 With several different alternatives to
14 consider, I know that this has been a
15 difficult task but obviously, Nye County has
16 preferences among those alternatives, and I
17 want you to know what they are.

18 During the public scoping meetings
19 that I attended in both Tonopah and Las Vegas,
20 and then again here this morning, emphasis has
21 been placed on the environmental impacts,
22 which of course, are very important. But my

1 responsibility as an elected official is to
2 anticipate and respond to potential impacts
3 that result from the final selection of any of
4 the alternatives that don't include no action.

5 So faced with those risks and
6 opportunities, Nye County contracted last year
7 with the Center for Economic Development at
8 the University of Nevada to produce a report
9 on the estimated economic impacts on northern
10 Nye, and our sister county next door,
11 Esmeralda County. And I'm going to leave a
12 copy of that with you today.

13 Nye County's perspective can
14 really be boiled down to two major points.
15 First, we prefer the alternatives that will
16 add good paying jobs to Nye County. Not those
17 that take away good paying jobs from Nye
18 County. And this is especially true in the
19 central county area. We need those jobs. And
20 allow me to be blunt, we think that you should
21 cite the CNPC with it's 4,500 operations
22 workers in Nye County.

1 We certainly have the room. The
2 combination of the NTTR and the NTS represents
3 one of the largest unpopulated land areas in
4 the United States, comprising more than 4.5
5 million acres. And we have proven that we
6 have the trained construction and operations
7 workers to do the work.

8 Second, your own sanctioned
9 independent analysis that I'm holding here
10 concludes that the Tonopah test range is the
11 best place to do flight testing. So why on
12 earth would you do it anywhere else. The
13 conclusion from NNSA's independent business
14 case analysis of Complex Transformation flight
15 test facilities report states, and I quote,
16 "Considering the collective impacts of costs,
17 using the standard, or using the cost standard
18 deviation and the mission risks the most
19 favorable alternative for both periods is to
20 upgrade the TTR with high tech mobile or HTM,
21 reduce the number of structures to a minimum,
22 and institute campaign operations whereby the

1 TTR is fully active part of the year, and in
2 custodial standby for the remainder, and that
3 is alternative, 2.2.2."

4 So again, why are you considering
5 options that are not consistent with the
6 judgement of your esteemed independent panel
7 of experts? I note that the operate TTRN
8 campaign mode alternative would still entail
9 the lost of jobs at TTR. So obviously we
10 oppose that option based obviously on the lost
11 of jobs. But my constituents and I would
12 appreciate a more detailed explanation of
13 campaign mode. When you account for the
14 business case analysis conclusion, why would
15 we even consider alternatives that have the
16 potential to compromise the safety, surety,
17 and reliability of our nuclear arsenal for
18 what one of my constituents noted is less than
19 the salary of one mediocre professional
20 baseball player, or about \$7 million dollars,
21 a good portion of which can be offset by your
22 "Work for Others" program.

1 I will close with an admonition.
2 In the context of our overall national
3 security needs, like it or not, nuclear
4 weapons remain the ultimate foundation. And
5 if TTR is the best place for flight test
6 gravity, delivered nuclear weapons, then why,
7 to paraphrase Benjamin Franklin, "...would you
8 give up a little national security to gain a
9 little money. You will deserve neither and
10 you could loose both." Thank you.

11 MR. BROWN:: Thank you. Kathy
12 Garger and Glenn Mara is next.

13 MS. GARGER: My name is Kathy
14 Garger. I'm here on behalf of all of your
15 children, and the children in your
16 neighborhoods, and every child that they will
17 ever have for the next 20, 30 billion years.
18 I'm here on behalf of the children who cannot
19 be here who would like to live. The number of
20 children and grandchildren with cancer in
21 their bones, with leukemia in their blood, or
22 with poison in their lungs might seem

1 statistically small to some, in comparison
2 with natural health hazards, but this is not
3 a natural health hazard. And it is not a
4 statistical issue.

5 The loss of even one human life,
6 or the malformation of even one baby who may
7 be born long after we are gone should be of
8 concern to us all. Our children and
9 grandchildren are not merely statistics
10 towards which we can be indifferent. That's
11 not my words, that's President John F.
12 Kennedy, June 1963. Your employer, the US
13 Government, the worst polluter our nation has
14 ever known, has taken our tax money that we
15 worked really hard for and created a toxic and
16 radioactive mess. When Grey Nun's sister,
17 Rosalie Bertell, a doctor as well, served on
18 the EPA, she said there were 74,000 toxic
19 waste dumps, and 32,000 of them were labeled
20 severe health hazards. Department of Energy
21 and Department of War were big polluters.

22 What kind of a nation have we

1 become that's content with continuously
2 contaminating the air, water and soil we and
3 our decedents and all living things need to
4 live. We've put greed in profit before the
5 health and well-being of our citizens. This
6 is not about defense, this is about money,
7 greed, profit.

8 I have studied extensively just
9 one of the labs, the Livermore Nuclear Weapons
10 laboratory. It sits within 50 miles of seven
11 million people. It sits within 100 miles of
12 ten million people. Right now they explode
13 1,000 pounds of radioactive and chemical
14 toxins into our air. They have applied to up
15 that by 800 percent. It's still in permit.
16 Application is to do 8,000 pounds. One of
17 them is uranium-238. We know that it's
18 depleted uranium. It's what we use on the so-
19 called enemy in the Middle East and in Somalia
20 now, too.

21 What they're doing is they're
22 exploding depleted uranium into lungs that are

1 also mined here in the D.C. area. Dr. Chris
2 Busby of the low level radiation campaign in
3 the U.K. discovered that in the Baghdad Shock
4 and Awe bombings in March and April of 2003,
5 it took only nine days to reach the U.K. and
6 hundreds and hundreds of percents of
7 radioactive radio nuclides were found in the
8 U.K., which means when you explode the Nevada
9 test site, Los Alamos, Livermore, it gets to
10 me here and all the children in the D.C. area,
11 never mind the rest of the nation within 10
12 days.

13 What you're calling high
14 explosives is actually a license to kill
15 Americans. I can tell you it has been
16 estimated by Sister Dr. Rosalie Bartell that
17 bomb production and testing so far has killed
18 385 million. Bomb and plant accidents, 9.7
19 million. Fatalities, 175 million. Genetic
20 damage, 235 million people. And 588 million
21 children born with malformations. She said
22 the probability of damage occurring when

1 someone is exposed to ionizing radiation is
2 100 percent.

3 So thank you. Do not believe me.
4 Go to the Department of Health, Washington
5 Radiation. Just Google those words. They
6 said the basic assumption of radiation
7 protection is that any dose of radiation poses
8 a health risk, any dose. We've had 15 nuclear
9 weapon complexes. Now there is eight. They
10 want to go down a little bit. We're becoming
11 a little more efficient in how we produce the
12 radiation that's effecting us. If you know
13 anyone with an autoimmune system disease, a
14 cancer, one our of three of us, just look
15 around. One of the three of you will get it.
16 Any kind of Leukemia, blood disorder,
17 autoimmune system disease include MS, Lupus,
18 Rheumatoid Arthritis, diabetes. This is not
19 funny. This is not defense. Why are we
20 producing poisons that are killing our own,
21 never mind the people who have done nothing to
22 harm us in the Middle East. Thank you.

1 MR. BROWN: Glenn Mara is next.

2 Bill Hartung will follow.

3 MR. MARA: My name is Glenn Mara.

4 I'm the principal associate director for the

5 weapons program of the Los Alamos National

6 Laboratory. I thank and welcome the

7 opportunity to speak briefly today. I stand

8 here both as a professional in support in

9 public service for national security, in these

10 laboratories as well as a private citizen.

11 And that's based on a combination of over 35

12 years of experience associated with this

13 commitment and the enterprise of the national

14 labs and the complex.

15 I'm here today to support the

16 preferred alternative. It's a very logical

17 and next step. The national leadership, the

18 will of Congress, and the administration since

19 the Cold War have been to exercise continued

20 prudence and basically a smaller, safer more

21 secure nuclear enterprise in service to all of

22 mankind, and in terms of service to the

1 protection, of course, to the United States.

2

3 Let me identify what I think are
4 some of the key elements that make this a very
5 logical next step, and probably a step that is
6 a goal shared by many, if not all in this
7 room. The nuclear danger does and can be
8 reduced, and can be minimized. And the
9 complex has taken and undertaken that goal in
10 response to the national will. It's been
11 based on a scientific set of capabilities and
12 a commitment across the complex to achieve
13 those goals.

14 The scientific underpinning has
15 allowed this country to maintain a confidence
16 without a return to underground nuclear
17 testing, and unprecedented levels of
18 disarmament. The labs in the complex have
19 been asked to preserve a capability to assure
20 our allies and deter potential adversaries.
21 And that progress has been maintained, and the
22 preferred alternative is a very logical and

1 sound step.

2 It's based on a scientific and
3 technical excellence, and a broadened expanse
4 to other potential threats in a very different
5 world with potential adversaries that still
6 require definition. The scientific
7 underpinning and excellence also are
8 appropriate and are relevant to energy
9 security, environmental security, and that's
10 where I would like to put some of my last
11 comments.

12 The complex in the old Cold War,
13 and the World War II vintage did have a
14 multitude of sins environmentally. There have
15 been a concerted effort in responsiveness to
16 that. The preferred alternative goes to a
17 smaller footprint, and contrary to some views
18 will not add to the environmental pollution
19 but represents a commitment of the government
20 as well as all of the workers to ensure the
21 colleagues health and security, and I hold a
22 deep and personal responsibility of the

1 protection of my fellow workers. And as a
2 parent and a grandparent that lives in
3 proximity of these capabilities, I have a
4 personal responsibility to that safety and
5 security, and the environmental consciousness
6 of this entire enterprise.

7 On a more local level, yes, there
8 will be a capability, a smaller footprint.
9 The capability at Los Alamos in specific will
10 ultimately allow Los Alamos to be inventoried.
11 Last year the laboratory made 11 pits. None
12 had been made since 1989. This year we will
13 make six. That is a very appropriate
14 response, and it will ultimately be determined
15 by our national leadership. Not by myself,
16 but what is required as we go to a smaller,
17 safer, more secure and a more environmentally
18 responsible enterprise.

19 Lastly, let me end by what I
20 believe has been the underpinning for these
21 dramatic reductions, and for the overall
22 competency and the leadership that I believe

1 this country is showing to the world to make
2 it safer and more secure. And that is the
3 scientific and technical underpinning that has
4 enabled these transformations that will enable
5 us to clean up the environmental issues that
6 remain across the complex, that will also
7 afford the technical and scientific expertise
8 that will be leveled at all of the national
9 problems, whether they be energy, environment,
10 national security. I thank you for the
11 opportunity.

12 MR. BROWN: Bill Hartung,
13 Christina Cernansky is next.

14 MR. HARTUNG: Good afternoon.
15 Bill Hartung, the director of the Arms and
16 Security Initiative at the New America
17 Foundation. The first thing I want to say is
18 that I think the Department of Energy's
19 preferred plan for upgrading modernizing and
20 nuclear weapons complex is provocative, is
21 premature, it's unnecessary, and it's a
22 massive waste to tax payer dollars. In

1 addition, the environmental impact statement
2 and thousands and thousands of pages that many
3 of us have at least looked at, if not read, is
4 incomplete.

5 And I think there is a number of
6 respects in which that is true. First of all,
7 there is a growing discussion in civil society
8 about a world free of nuclear weapons. People
9 like former secretaries of state, George
10 Shultz and Henry Kissinger, former defense
11 secretary, William Perry. Former senate armed
12 services committee chair, Sam Nunn, and many
13 other dignitaries, former secretaries of
14 state, former arms control negotiators.
15 People with the technical expertise on the
16 nuclear weapons issue.

17 So given this and the fact that we
18 have presidential candidates talk in similar
19 terms, why isn't a zero nuclear weapons option
20 considered in the PEIS. And I think part of
21 the reason is because NNSA takes a very narrow
22 view of its mandate. They say in Volume II of

1 the EIS, "Existing and reasonably foreseeable
2 national security requirements" will be
3 considered in this massive document.

4 So I guess it depends on what you
5 think is reasonable. Isn't it reasonable to
6 consider, for example, how and why proceeding
7 with the production of new nuclear weapons,
8 and new nuclear weapons factories is likely to
9 provoke other countries to begin or accelerate
10 their own efforts to seek their own nuclear
11 arsenals. Isn't the possibility of spurring
12 nuclear proliferation and impact that must be
13 considered before going forward with this
14 plan.

15 Furthermore, the advocates of
16 eliminating nuclear weapons have one
17 overriding concern, which is keeping them out
18 of the hands of terrorists. The fewer nuclear
19 weapons that exist, the less bomb making
20 material that exists, the less likely there is
21 the terrorists will get their hands on a
22 nuclear weapon. Isn't looking at the

1 prospects of reproductions, or elimination of
2 nuclear weapons given this threat of terrorist
3 acquisition of nuclear weapons. The most
4 reasonable alternative of all. And so if
5 we're going to look at what's reasonable, how
6 could we not look at that option.

7 As I said, this proposal is also
8 premature. It's certainly foreseeable that
9 we're going to have a new president in 2009.
10 It's foreseeable that president is going to
11 want to look at our nuclear posture and decide
12 what it should be for the decades to come.
13 Therefore, there is no reason to rush ahead
14 now with investments in new nuclear weapons
15 facilities, or research on new nuclear
16 weapons.

17 In addition, as I mentioned, this
18 plan is unnecessary. Particularly the parts
19 that call, for example, for production of new
20 plutonium kits. In the words of the JASON
21 Report, a group of distinguished experts had
22 advised the Pentagon in these matters, "the

1 primaries of most weapons systems types in the
2 stockpile have credible minimum lifetimes in
3 excess of 100 years. The intrinsic lifetime
4 of plutonium in pits is greater than a
5 century." So there is certainly no rush to
6 build a new plutonium pit facility.

7 As I mentioned, this is also a
8 very wasteful proposition. The DOE and NSA
9 have finally done at least a partial economic
10 analysis of what this might cost in some of
11 the appendices to the EIS. And to the extent
12 that you can sort of weigh through the
13 assumptions that are made, and the assertions
14 that are made, there is a couple of
15 interesting points. First of all, they talk
16 about new investments of at least 40 to 60
17 billion dollars just to deal with the special
18 nuclear materials aspects of the new Complex
19 Transformation plants.

20 There has also been an analysis
21 done earlier that shows that the existing
22 complex would cost about \$170 billion dollars

1 if we just kept it as is. So if you look at
2 those new investments and you look at that
3 \$170 billion dollars, we're easily talking
4 about \$200 billion dollars or more between now
5 and 2030. And DOE's own consultants point out
6 that any possible savings from efficiencies of
7 the new complex are not going to kick in until
8 2060. So we're talking about 50 years from
9 now. 50 years from now, hopefully we won't
10 have nuclear weapons. We certainly won't have
11 them at the levels we have now. And for that
12 reason, I think it's unacceptable to be
13 investing tax payer money in any of these
14 initiatives at this point in time. Thank you.

15 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay,
16 Christina Cernansky and David Culp will be
17 next.

18 MS. CERNANSKY: Hi. Thank you so
19 much for giving me this opportunity to speak
20 with you today. My name is Christina
21 Cernansky and I'm here on behalf WAND, Women's
22 Action for New Directions, and WiLL, the Women

1 Legislators Lobby. WiLL currently represents
2 over one third of the women's state
3 legislators in all 50 states. I'm going to
4 read you a statement on behalf of Susan Shaer,
5 WAND Executive Director, and WiLL President,
6 State Senator Nan Grogan Orrock, "Complex
7 Transformation is Department of Energy's plan
8 to revamp nuclear weapons complex in order to
9 build new nuclear warheads. The government
10 accountability office estimates that this
11 project will run for 150 billion to 175
12 billion between now and 2030.

13 Rather than spending that money on
14 this proposal, Women's Action for New
15 Directions believes we should move towards
16 eliminating nuclear weapons. In the 1980s,
17 WAND was named Women's Action for Nuclear
18 Disarmament. Though we changed our name and
19 broadened our mission in 1991, we continue to
20 be ardent supporters of nuclear disarmament.
21 Our goal is to make the world as safe as
22 possible, and ensure security at home as well

1 as around the world as via Shultz-Kissinger."

2
3 Now, and opinion piece of January
4 2008 stated, "We endured setting a goal of a
5 world free of nuclear weapons, and working
6 energetically on the actions required to
7 achieve that goal. In the US, a better way to
8 allocate those billions of dollars would be to
9 dismantle our own nuclear weapons stockpile.
10 In addition, we encourage our government to
11 follow the five strategies towards universal
12 compliance, recommended by a 2005 Carnegie
13 Endowment for International Security Report.
14 Those five strategies are to, one, make sure
15 that there are no nuclear weapons states; two,
16 secure all nuclear materials; three, stop
17 illegal transfers; four, devalue the political
18 and military currency of nuclear weapons; and
19 five, commit to conflict resolution. Thank
20 you for your time and consideration, and the
21 utmost important issue facing national
22 security of this country. Signed, Susan

1 Shaer, WAND Executive Director, and Will
2 President, Georgia State Senator, Nan Grogan
3 Orrock. Thank you again.

4 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay.
5 David Culp and Marie Lucey will be after
6 David.

7 MR. CULP: Good afternoon, my name
8 is David Culp. I'm with the Friends Committee
9 on National Legislation, and we're going to be
10 submitting a joint statement from 16 national
11 religious organizations, includes Protestant,
12 Catholic, Muslim and Jewish national
13 organizations. I'm going to read just a few
14 parts of the summary. The whole statement is
15 about six pages long.

16 "As religious leaders, we firmly
17 oppose the administration's multibillion
18 dollar plan to rebuild the nation's nuclear
19 weapons capabilities through the Complex
20 Transformation proposal. The administration's
21 plans, we believe, are dangerous and
22 expensive, and could reignite an arms race,

1 encourage proliferation and reduce national
2 security. We believe that to resump US
3 nuclear warhead production and possibly build
4 new weapons is called for by the Energy
5 Department's preferred plan risks lives of the
6 entire human family.

7 Instead, we urge political leaders
8 to take immediate and deliberate steps toward
9 multilateral nuclear disarmament. Many of
10 these steps would directly involve the Energy
11 Department, and the future of the nuclear
12 weapons complex including increasing non-
13 proliferation efforts, accelerating weapon
14 dismantlement, and extending key arms control
15 treaties. To this list we would also add
16 pursuing alternative missions for the national
17 nuclear laboratories. This path, away from
18 nuclear weapons would make all of us safer,
19 and is consistent with our moral values. If
20 we propose a no weapon -- I'm sorry, a no
21 production alternative, and we have four
22 specific steps that we'd like for the

1 department of energy to consider as part of
2 this. One, place a moratorium on new warhead
3 design. Second, do not expand plutonium pit
4 production capability. Three, which we agree
5 with you, is consolidate and downsize the
6 nuclear weapons complex. And four, continue
7 the nuclear weapons testing moratorium."

8 We're going to be submitting this
9 but I also just want to give a very few brief
10 comments of my own. The metaphor that we
11 heard earlier from deputy administrator,
12 Smolen, was that the NNSA is at a crossroads.
13 I think probably a better metaphor is that
14 NNSA is adrift. It has had a long list of
15 proposals that has submitted, all of which
16 have been rejected by the Congress. A modern
17 pit facility rejected by Congress.
18 Consolidated plutonium center rejected by
19 Congress. The nuclear bunker buster rejected
20 by Congress. Advanced concepts initiative,
21 rejected by Congress. The reliable
22 replacement warhead, rejected by Congress.

1 These projects also do not enjoy public
2 support.

3 Your own summary says that in the
4 earlier comment period during the scoping
5 period, you received some 35,000 comments.
6 Most of whom were from people posing nuclear
7 weapons. I think the rate that you've
8 received comments today exceeds even that.
9 Instead, I think the energy department should
10 be looking at a new vision. I already got a
11 handout. I'm just going to refer to this.
12 The stapled one, it says, "NNSA's Challenges."
13 And I agree, they do have challenges.

14 At the very top is the current
15 mission of the NNSA. In your spare time, take
16 a look at that mission and tell me what it is
17 that is the product that comes out of this
18 government agency. You can't find it in this
19 mission. Also, tell me what is different
20 about this mission compared to say, another 15
21 agencies at the Defense Department. There is
22 nothing unique. And instead, what I would

1 encourage the Energy Department to look at is
2 reframing it's mission to focusing on the non-
3 proliferation treaty. That's the guiding
4 light that you're -- that the public has been
5 asking you to look at. It's also what the
6 international communities asked the United
7 States to look at.

8 And when I say the non-
9 proliferation treaty, we're talking about both
10 disarmament and also non-proliferation.
11 You're going to simply have trouble
12 maintaining your budgets with a pursual of new
13 nuclear weapons maintaining weapons
14 capabilities. Instead, you need to recapture
15 the imagination of the American public, and to
16 me, I think that is pursuing nuclear non-
17 proliferation treaty is the guiding principle
18 for the department. Thank you.

19 MR. BROWN: Okay. Marie Lucey.
20 Nick Roth will follow.

21 MS. LUCEY: Thank you. My name is
22 Marie Lucey, and I'm a Franciscan Sister, and

1 in addition to the sign in statement to which
2 David Culp referred, I also wish to offer an
3 additional statement on behalf of the
4 leadership conference of Women Religious, a
5 national organization of elected leaders of US
6 congregations of Women Religious representing
7 over 60,000 Catholic Sisters.

8 Today's hearing is a deja vu
9 scene. In December 2006, I was here to offer
10 testimony against the DOE proposed Complex
11 2030. In 2007, we applauded the Congress for
12 improving zero dollars for that proposal to
13 build the consolidated plutonium center to
14 produce up to 200 nuclear warheads per year.
15 Now, here we are back again in 2008 to again
16 say no.

17 Today, the proposed bomb plan with
18 it's production capacity of 80 warheads a year
19 is smaller than the Complex 2030 request. But
20 its' intent is the same, to enable an increase
21 in US nuclear weapons production capacity.
22 Well, we agreed with the recommendation to

1 consolidate weapons grade nuclear materials
2 into fewer locations, and reduce the nuclear
3 stockpile. We still strongly oppose the
4 building of a new bomb plant. Increasing our
5 country's capacity to produce nuclear warheads
6 not only threatens our compliance with the
7 nuclear non-proliferation treaty, but goes
8 against US public opinion, and follows an
9 outmoded view of the world and way of
10 thinking.

11 The proposal ignores the need for
12 an overhaul of the larger US security
13 strategy. As you know, Congress has ordered
14 two new studies on the role of nuclear weapons
15 to commit increasingly scarce US Dollars to
16 this unnecessary, and misdirected bomb plant
17 would be folly. Rather, this is the moment
18 for strategizing how to achieve a nuclear
19 weapon's free world. Others can address the
20 scientific and technological arguments better
21 than I. For us, a very strong argument
22 against the building of a new bomb plant lies

1 in our religious belief, and in the social
2 teachings of our church.

3 This year marks the 25th
4 anniversary of the US Catholic Bishops Peace
5 Pastoral Letter on War and Peace. In 1983,
6 the bishops declared the whole world must
7 summon the moral courage and technical means
8 to say no to nuclear conflict. No to weapons
9 of mass destruction. No to an arms race which
10 robs the poor and the vulnerable. And one
11 year ago, the Conference of Bishops stated a
12 global ban on nuclear weapons is more than a
13 moral idea. It should be a policy goal. Our
14 country has the technical means the bishops
15 called for. When will it muster the moral
16 courage.

17 One of William Shakespeare's often
18 quoted lines is "A rose by any other name
19 would smell as sweet." In a more sinister
20 application, changing the name from Complex
21 2030 to Complex Transformation does not change
22 the dangerous costly, and misguided intent of

1 the proposal to increase US capacity to build
2 new nuclear weapons. The name itself is
3 particularly repugnant to people of faith, for
4 whom transformation has a sacred connotation
5 often referring to a spiritual change for the
6 better.

7 The proposed chemistry and
8 metallurgy replacement nuclear facility to be
9 built at Los Alamos is not a change for the
10 better. But a big step backward in ridding
11 the world of nuclear weapons. The leadership
12 conference of Women Religious speaks against
13 this plan. We urge the Department of Energy
14 to put its expertise at the service of
15 creating needed environmentally friendly
16 alternative energy sources, and to ways of
17 denuclearizing existing US arsenals. We will
18 be happy to testify on behalf of such worthwhile
19 proposals. Thank you.

20 MR. BROWN: Nick Roth and Cindy
21 Kelly will be next.

22 MR. ROTH: For all of our sakes, I

1 hope it's easier for DOE to prevent nuclear
2 weapons accidents than it is for them to get
3 the audiovisual right in their presentations.
4 My name is Nick Roth. I am the Washington,
5 D.C. Office Director for the Nuclear Age Peace
6 Foundation. We're an advocacy organization
7 that works towards the elimination of nuclear
8 weapons around the world.

9 Last -- this past February, on
10 February 16, my organization in conjunction
11 with a number of other organizations sponsored
12 a people's hearing on nuclear weapons policy
13 and complex transformation in Madison,
14 Wisconsin. The logic of the hearing was that
15 while the NEPA process, the National
16 Environmental Policy Act is important, and
17 it's a great chance for people to submit their
18 opinions on the Department of Energy's
19 proposed Complex Transformation that opinions
20 need to be heard further than just the areas
21 around the effected sites.

22 The nuclear weapons policies and

1 the Complex Transformation, and what we do
2 with our nuclear weapons arsenal affects far
3 more than just those areas. So in Madison
4 Wisconsin, groups of nuclear experts,
5 representatives of state and federal
6 government, members of the general public and
7 citizens groups came together to voice their
8 opinion on nuclear weapons. In total, 62
9 People submitted opinions on nuclear weapons.
10 To summarize the general feeling of the group,
11 the statement was the opinions were, "The
12 policies of the Bush administration reflected
13 in the SPEIS have continued and built on an
14 outmoded way of thinking, and are in violation
15 of the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

16 By reemphasizing the role of
17 nuclear weapons in military planning,
18 maintaining a massive nuclear arsenal,
19 proposing a new generation of nuclear weapons
20 under the reliable replacement warhead, and
21 building new nuclear weapons under stockpile
22 of stewardship, and modernizing nuclear

1 weapons infrastructure under Complex
2 Transformation. The Bush administration has
3 jeopardized the security of all Americans.

4 And I noticed in the presentation
5 earlier, the Department of Energy, as well as
6 in their documents continually relies upon the
7 2001 nuclear posture view by the Bush
8 administration. Last year, Congress said this
9 document was outdated, and the 2008 Defense
10 Authorization Bill required a new nuclear
11 postural view to reflect today's real security
12 concerns, not those reflected in Complex
13 Transformation.

14 I'd now like to take this time to
15 read excerpts from the hearing in Madison,
16 Wisconsin. Represented at the hearing was US
17 Senator, Russell Feingold, US Representative,
18 Tammy Baldwin, State Senator, Frederick
19 Kessler, and State Senator, Mark Miller. I'm
20 going to be submitting the comments of all of
21 the People who attended as well as the
22 statements by the People who I'm going to

1 read.

2 I'm just reading a couple of
3 excerpts from the people I just listed. From
4 State Representative, Frederick Kessler, "It
5 is important that the United States honor its
6 obligations. I believe a program such as the
7 Department of Energy has proposed, Complex
8 Transformation, would both literally and
9 symbolically be a violation of our agreement
10 with the non-proliferation treaty in signatory
11 nations. Recent studies show that America's
12 current nuclear weapons stock is sufficient
13 for the next hundred years. Therefore, there
14 is no reason to pour countless billions of tax
15 payer dollars into a new program to rejuvenate
16 our nuclear weapons complex.

17 It is my sense that if the federal
18 government has the money to build bombs, then
19 presumably it has the money to build schools.
20 Our scare resources should be used to ensure
21 that all American's have access to affordable
22 healthcare, to protect our environment, and to

1 see that our education system would turn to
2 the head of the class.

3 From representative, Tammy
4 Baldwin, "I want to take this opportunity to
5 reaffirm my support for the non-proliferation
6 strategies designed to eliminate weapons of
7 mass destruction from US and worldwide
8 arsenals. I strongly support the treaty of
9 the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which
10 sets forth objectives to prevent the spread of
11 nuclear weapons and weapons technology, and
12 further the goals of achieving nuclear
13 disarmament.

14 From Senator Russell Feingold, "We
15 must aggressively work to reinvigorate the
16 global non-proliferation regime. In an age of
17 nuclear terrorism, this is more important than
18 ever. As one of the two countries with the
19 most nuclear weapons, we must fulfill our
20 commitments under the nuclear non-
21 proliferation treaty if we expect other
22 nations to forego nuclear weapons. For all of

1 the reasons that I've indicated, and as well
2 as on behalf of those who attended the
3 conference, we oppose the preferred
4 alternative in the SPEIS, and we seek to work
5 towards the elimination of nuclear weapons."

6 I have in my possession a DVD of the hearing.
7 If there are any members of the press that are
8 still here who would like a copy of it, I'm
9 happy to give it to you. We'll also be
10 submitting a copy of it for the Department of
11 Energy. Thank you.

12 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Cindy
13 Kelly. Christopher Paine will follow Cindy.

14 MS. KELLY: Hi, I'm Cindy Kelly
15 and for disclosure, I used to be on the other
16 side of this microphone coming from the
17 audience. I worked for the Department of
18 Energy in the 90's to try to open up the
19 decision making to the public. I want to
20 applaud NSA for its efforts to really go the
21 full hundred yards in having these hearings
22 all around the country, and providing as many

1 opportunities as possible so to let the public
2 weigh in on this very important decision.

3 Since I left the Department, my
4 mission has been to try to preserve its
5 history. I think no matter what position you
6 have on the issues at hand, it is the similar
7 event of the 20th century that's left an
8 indelible imprint on the 21st and foreseeable
9 future. I want to say as this plan, one way
10 or another, is inevitably going to try to
11 reduce the footprint. And in doing so we'll,
12 you know, target surface properties. And we
13 have been working with each of the communities
14 around the nation to preserve just a few of
15 those that are most important to the Manhattan
16 Project. That's what we started with. And
17 we're pleased that it looks like we will be
18 able to have some of the iconic facilities,
19 the V reactor at Hanford, the V site at Los
20 Alamos, and a hand full of other properties,
21 as well as maybe a portion of the huge gaseous
22 to fusion plant at Oakridge.

1 Why save them? Why do you need a
2 physical property? It will be debated for the
3 rest of our life times and for future
4 generations. What the nuclear weapons should
5 have been used for or not used for. But
6 that's for -- unless we have that, which is so
7 much a part of our American history and world
8 history to have the tangible reality of what
9 was created, I think we all loose a lot. And
10 it's all the voices. Your voices today. The
11 Department's voices that need to be captured.
12 And this sounds like a crass promotion, but I
13 just wanted to let you know that we have been
14 hard at work. This is an anthology that on
15 the Manhattan Project, but just came out in
16 the Fall, and you will see that it tries to
17 capture the first hand accounts of the people
18 who were actually working on the Manhattan
19 Project, as well as the Seminole historic
20 documents.

21 This was done with the aide of
22 novice and two Pulitzer prize winning

1 historians, Richard Rhodes and Kai Bird, as
2 well as Robert Norris, and Bill Lanuwet, and
3 others who I'm sure many in the room know to
4 ensure we had the right stuff. Plus a lot of
5 oral histories that my organization has been
6 gathering. In fact, I'm off to Prince on a
7 2:00 train. So I've got to hustle out of
8 here. But I'm delighted to be interviewing
9 Freeman Dyson and Val Fitch at Princeton.

10 At any rate, we've been working
11 hard and cooperatively to try to preserve
12 this, and I just have my little message is
13 that, you know, for those 600 properties that
14 may be at risk, that we work together to make
15 sure that those that are most important in
16 this cold war history, which is sort of the
17 next stage is, you know, are not just
18 completely destroyed without preserving the
19 most important of them. Thank you.

20 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

21 Christopher Paine. Sheryl Wertz will be next,
22 and let me again remind folks, if you have

1 cell phones, either turn them off or at least
2 mute them so we don't interfere with the
3 speakers.

4 MR. PAINE: My name is Christopher
5 Paine. I direct the nuclear program of the
6 Natural Resources Defense Council where I'm
7 proud to say Robert Morris works, our nuclear
8 historian. I have prepared a statement for
9 the record but I'll just try to abbreviate the
10 remarks. We welcome this opportunity to
11 comment on the draft, SPEIS. Incredibly NSA
12 appears to have ignored thousands of public
13 comments that were submitted during scoping.

14 These comments, many thousands of
15 them, requested that NSA analyzed the full
16 range of reasonable alternatives for
17 consolidating a nuclear weapons complex
18 between now and 2030, including the
19 alternative that would both support and
20 reflect implementation of our nations
21 obligations under the NPT and the CTVT to
22 negotiate progressive reduction and eventual

1 elimination of its nuclear arsenal, in concert
2 with other nuclear powers.

3 Instead, the current draft
4 analysis is explicitly guided, as someone
5 mentioned earlier, by a widely discredited
6 nuclear posture review report that former
7 Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, not
8 President Bush, he had nothing to do with it.

9 But former Secretary of Defense, Donald
10 Rumsfeld, submitted to Congress in December
11 2001, this was merely a report to Congress,
12 that's all it was, it's treated as it's some
13 kind of high order executive order directing
14 DOE to do the various things that are
15 mentioned in that report.

16 Even at the time, this now
17 obsolete report was limited in Secretary
18 Rumsfeld's words, his own words, to laying out
19 the direction of American nuclear forces over
20 the next five to ten years. Well, ten years
21 from 2001 is the end of 2010. So it's not
22 conceivable that this document can then become

1 the basis for analysis that's looking forward
2 to the year 2030. So that needs to be fixed.
3 In fact, I would argue that all references to
4 that document should be expunged especially in
5 view of the fact that Congress has now
6 mandated two additional reviews. One in the
7 Executive Branch, and one by an independent
8 commission to look at the matter of US nuclear
9 weapons and non-proliferation policy.

10 I think one statistic from this
11 analysis says it all. In 1995, four years
12 after the collapse of the Soviet Union, NSA's
13 operational complex consisted of eight sites
14 in seven states. Under its proposed plan by
15 2020, that is 25 years later from 1995, NSA's
16 operational nuclear weapons complex will still
17 consist of the same eight sites in the same
18 seven states. This complex will be
19 maintaining a weapons stockpile that could
20 well be one-tenth to one-twentieth or even
21 smaller in size.

22 So what we have here is a

1 blatantly political industrial complex that
2 would still have two nuclear weapon design
3 laboratories, a nuclear weapons test site, new
4 uranium and plutonium processing facilities,
5 and a new privatized weapons parts plant in
6 Kansas City. Now under NEPA alternative that
7 presumes, the agency doesn't have to agree
8 with it, but the alternative would have to
9 presume good faith US compliance with the NPT
10 and the CTBT. And NSA must examine closure of
11 its underground nuclear weapons testing
12 grounds in Nevada while consolidating nuclear
13 warhead stockpile support functions at Los
14 Alamos, getting rid of a second weapons
15 laboratory, and consolidating non nuclear
16 component production at Sandia National
17 Laboratory.

18 There is no need to maintain two
19 nuclear weapon design laboratories. We know
20 this. Or even a reasonably foreseeable
21 requirement for a competitive nuclear weapons
22 design establishment in the future. One

1 nuclear design laboratory is a sufficient
2 hedge. There is no need to maintain a nuclear
3 weapons test site in Nevada when all but a few
4 nations are already committed to observing the
5 comprehensive test ban treaty and the
6 remaining holdouts are merely waiting for the
7 United States and China to ratify.

8 Nor is there any reason and need
9 to produce new plutonium pits. There is
10 thousands of existing surplus pits are long
11 lived and available to be refurbished and
12 recycled. I think the Department needs to
13 look at what I call the Southwest Triangle
14 alternative of consolidating the bulk of the
15 weapons complex into a triangle represented by
16 Pantex, Sandia and Los Alamos. And also look
17 at the prospect of consolidating uranium
18 processing and fabrication operations either
19 at Pantex or Los Alamos leaving the civilian
20 storage facility that's just been constructed
21 at Y-12 in place to deal with surplus Uranium
22 has been transferred to the civil sector.

1 To me there are several such more
2 far-reaching consolidation alternatives that
3 are not examined here, and that are
4 objectively reasonable. And if the department
5 needs to get into account in view of
6 possibilities for future litigation. Thank
7 you.

8 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Sheryl
9 Wertz is next. Pamela Moffat will follow.

10 MS. WERTZ: Good afternoon, my
11 name is Sheryl Wertz and I'm the executive
12 director at Peace Action New York State, and
13 the Peace Action Fund of New York State.
14 Founded in 1957 as the committee for a sane
15 nuclear policy, Peace Action is dedicated to
16 promoting the non-violent resolution of
17 conflict, the abolition of nuclear weapons,
18 and building a human rights culture. The New
19 York State affiliate of which I am the
20 director has hundreds of members, and 13
21 chapters around the state.

22 I want to take a couple of minutes

1 of your time this afternoon to speak
2 specifically to how this program would impact
3 New York State residents, and to support a no
4 production alternative. Complex
5 Transformation is a bad investment for New
6 York State. According to the National
7 Priorities Project, tax payers in 32 states
8 pay more in military spending that is returned
9 to the state in salaries, contracts and other
10 expenditures. New York State had the third
11 worst return on its investment. For every one
12 dollar that we spend on military spending,
13 including Department of Energy expenditures
14 for nuclear weapons, only 24 cents comes back
15 to the state.

16 I came to Washington, D.C. today
17 because there are no formal public comment
18 hearings on Complex Transformation being held
19 anywhere in the northeast. The vast majority
20 of your hearings are being held in communities
21 near national nuclear laboratories for them
22 in New Mexico. According to the same National

1 Priorities Project survey, residents of New
2 Mexico get the highest return on their
3 military and nuclear spending. Five dollars
4 back for every dollar spent.

5 I do not begrudge residents of
6 communities supported by nuclear laboratories
7 or their desire to support their families.
8 But the question before this committee today
9 is not, "Should we spend \$150 billion dollars
10 on upgrading and enhancing our nuclear
11 arsenal, but how should the federal government
12 spend \$150 billion dollars?"

13 The National Priorities Project
14 study went on to review how various federal
15 funding programs impact the economy, including
16 the type of jobs generated. The study found
17 that spending on education creates more and
18 higher paying jobs, than the same amount of
19 money spent on the military. Public spending
20 on healthcare and energy efficiency also
21 create more jobs, and have an overall economic
22 impact that's higher than that of military

1 spending. This study does not even take into
2 account the positive long-term economic impact
3 of workforce skill training, or infra
4 structural improvements.

5 There are two specific local
6 experiences that make New Yorker's equally
7 weary of the environmental cost of any new
8 nuclear weapons production, storage or
9 movement. The nuclear reactors at Indian
10 Point in Westchester County are such an
11 environmental danger that earlier this month,
12 the state of New York took the unprecedented
13 step of supporting the legal battle to prevent
14 the plans operating license from being
15 renewed.

16 Since August 2005, radioactive
17 contaminants have been leaking from Indian
18 Point into ground water and the Hudson River.
19 As of January of 2007, neither the private
20 company that runs Indian Point, nor the
21 Nuclear Regulatory Commission have been able
22 to identify the source of the leaks, determine

1 their extent, or develop a plan to stop them.
2 New York State's other primary nuclear
3 experience comes from the production of
4 depleted uranium weapons at National Lead
5 Industries in suburban Albany in the 1960s and
6 70s.

7 As with all the facilities,
8 National Lead Industries was subject to
9 federal environmental regulations, but a
10 significant lack of oversight prevented that
11 regulation from being enforced over time. By
12 1984, the federal government had acknowledged
13 that the NL Industries site was such an
14 environmental disaster that it shut down
15 production and agreed to take responsibility
16 for the clean up. The project took more than
17 20 years, required the removal of 150 tons of
18 soil, and cost \$190 million dollars. But
19 despite that colossal effort, high
20 concentrations of DU particles can still be
21 found in the soil and household dust in the
22 vicinity of the site in the middle of downtown

1 Albany.

2 MR. BROWN: One minute left.

3 MS. WERTZ: In 2007, 23 years
4 after DU production ceased at that plant, 100
5 percent of former plant workers and 20 percent
6 of local residents tested still had DU in
7 their urine. The moral of New York States
8 environmental story is that even well intended
9 federal regulations have not, are not and will
10 not prevent negative environmental impact at
11 nuclear weapons production, storage or
12 transportation facilities.

13 New Yorkers, in general, do not
14 believe that nuclear weapons, even the newer
15 smaller, safer nuclear weapons envisioned by
16 Complex Transformation make us safer. By
17 spending any money on nuclear weapons
18 technology, we are announcing that our top
19 priority is intimidation rather than mutual
20 cooperation. The production of more nuclear
21 weapons, even smaller, safer, newer weapons
22 threaten, and in an attempt to threaten our

1 enemies into submission, simply creates a
2 perpetual game of one-up-manship in which it
3 is either strike first or it may be too late
4 to strike at all.

5 I have come here today to
6 represent the members of Peace Action New York
7 State in asking you to reject the proposal to
8 spend \$150 billion dollars on Complex
9 Transformation. We do not need improved
10 nuclear warheads. We need to dismantle our
11 current weapons stockpile and create
12 environmental containment procedures for the
13 current supply of depleted uranium. We need
14 to fund educational opportunities,
15 improvements in infrastructure and economic
16 development. The residents of New York State
17 feel strongly that this proposal is a bad
18 investment in our economy, our environment,
19 and our security. Thank you.

20 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay,
21 Pamela Moffat, Charlie McMillan will be next.

22 MS. MOFFAT: My name is Pamela

1 Moffat. I'm a member of the Episcopal Peace
2 Fellowship. I'm happy that the National
3 Nuclear Security Administration is becoming
4 concerned about their environmental
5 responsibilities at Los Alamos. A Franciscan,
6 Richard Rohr, lives near Los Alamos and has
7 written that the Native Americans displaced
8 from their land there, hold an exorcism there
9 annually against the continuing harm.

10 Washington has an environmental
11 film festival every year. The 16th has just
12 ended last Saturday. This year was the
13 biggest and best ever with 115 environmental
14 films. I saw three of them. The first was
15 "Scarred Lands and Wounded Lives: The
16 Environmental Footprint of War." A second one
17 by a Japanese director was about Hiroshima and
18 Nagasaki, narrated by survivors. It's title:
19 "White Light, Black Rain." The third was
20 about the 60 year history of Hanford. On the
21 map we just saw, it was X'ed out, but the
22 clean up will never be completed. It is

1 impossible, again, scarred lands and many
2 wounded lives.

3 I wished that everyone everywhere
4 in the world working on any nuclear job could
5 see these three movies. I am old enough to
6 remember Pearl Harbor. We lived in Japan as
7 a family not long after the war. There was a
8 time when much of the world admired us, and
9 our country's goals and values. Many of which
10 the United States shared and used to help
11 other countries. But we seem to have made a
12 turn into becoming a dysfunctional country
13 with malice towards many. And we have helped
14 to turn dysfunction at home into our foreign
15 policy. Before the bombs ended the war in
16 1945, the scientist who produced them were
17 already saying and writing that although they
18 had been created, we should never use them.

19 In the decades since, there has
20 been landmark treaties to stop production and
21 to dismantle stockpiles. But in our present
22 dysfunction, we have avoided the promises made

1 in those treaties. Instead of destroying our
2 weapons, we have destroyed any residue of good
3 will. \$150 billion dollars may appear
4 reasonable to some economists, but we are
5 already spending \$110 million dollars a day on
6 our existing nuclear courses. If you add that
7 to the \$150 billion, the nuclear budget alone
8 by 2030 would reach \$1 trillion dollars.

9 And imagine what the rest of the
10 world will be doing in the years between now
11 and 2030. If we were to approve this complex
12 plan, enhanced or otherwise, they will be
13 wasting time worldwide, and worldwide
14 resources as well to be ready for the new
15 threat which our country will become to them.

16 MR. BROWN: You've got a minute
17 left.

18 MS. MOFFAT: Okay. Thank you.
19 Instead of working to terrorize the whole
20 world, we need to be working to stabilize it.
21 Instead of our growing our enormous arsenal,
22 and contemplating future growth, we must

1 instead cooperate to stabilize the universal
2 problems. We have the skills. We can
3 resurrect the will. The entire idea of 2030
4 is dangerous as a distraction. Our security
5 and the security of the entire planet lie in
6 a world without weapons and that will be the
7 starting place to deal with the things which
8 can really threaten us all. Thank you.

9 MR. BROWN: Okay. Charlie
10 McMillan. Timothy O'Connell, and Judith
11 Mohling is next.

12 MR. O'CONNELL: Good morning, my
13 name is Tim O'Connell. I will be submitting
14 a written document. I'm just going to
15 summarize right now. I've come here today on
16 behalf of the Maryknoll Office for Global
17 Concerns. The office represents hundreds of
18 Catholic Maryknoll missionaries, priests,
19 sisters, brothers and lay people living and
20 working among poor and marginalized People
21 around the world.

22 I am here to voice our opposition

1 to Complex Transformation and to support a no
2 production alternative. We are opposed to
3 Complex Transformation for two simple reasons,
4 nuclear weapons posses the power to destroy
5 God's Earth as we know it. And two, there is
6 no reason to replace the current arsenal
7 because it is reliable, unnecessary and
8 dangerous. We oppose nuclear weapons because
9 they continue to harm people, plants and
10 animal long after an initial detonation. The
11 site of a nuclear explosion is poison for
12 decades, causing cancer, deformities and
13 death. We take seriously our Biblical
14 responsibility as stewards of God's creation.
15 No person, no group, no nation, should have
16 the power to destroy what God has given us
17 all.

18 We are People of faith and reason.
19 The moral arguments against nuclear weapons in
20 general are clear, as are the practical
21 problems associated with Complex
22 Transformation in particular. One of the

1 greatest threats to the US is terrorist attack
2 using weapons of mass destruction on American
3 soils. Possessing thousands of nuclear
4 warheads that did not deter the attacks of
5 9/11 and "new nukes" will not deter another.
6 There are only two ways a terrorist group
7 could acquire nuclear weapons or the
8 technology and material to build one. They
9 can steal it or buy it. We believe DOE should
10 be using scarce resources to secure and/or
11 eliminate nuclear material than replacing
12 warheads that will be reliable for decades.

13 Two, enhancing our own nuclear
14 arsenal while threatening others we suspect of
15 developing nuclear weapons undermines non-
16 proliferation efforts. Complex Transformation
17 would declare to the world that the United
18 States does not intend to live up to its
19 obligations under the NPT to work towards
20 nuclear disarmament.

21 As DOE acknowledges, it is not
22 about numbers, but about capabilities.

1 Complex Transformation demonstrates that
2 nuclear weapons will remain an indispensable
3 component of US national security strategy.
4 With such a clear statement, how will the US
5 convince other countries not to build nuclear
6 weapons. With newer weapons? We believe
7 reducing the US commitment to nuclear weapons
8 will advance non-proliferation efforts and
9 make us all safer. Complex Transformation is
10 symptomatic of the delusion that a nation's
11 security is determined by the destructive
12 power of their weapons.

13 Despite our overwhelming military
14 superiority, the threat environment today is
15 more complicated than it has ever been in the
16 United States. The reality is in the long
17 term security cannot be achieved with more
18 weapons. To the extent US policies make
19 others feel vulnerable, we will be vulnerable.
20 To the extent our policies help others feel
21 secure, we will be secure.

22 US national security is

1 inextricably linked to global human security.
2 We must make better use of diplomatic,
3 economic and development initiatives to
4 mitigate threats.

5 MR. BROWN: One minute.

6 MR. O'CONNELL: Thank you. US
7 citizens and people around the world will be
8 more secure when we shift funding from waging
9 war to alleviating poverty. Maryknoll
10 missionaries experience on the ground with the
11 course of the poor, affirms our common
12 humanity, our connection to each other and to
13 God's creation. We enter city slums and rural
14 villages as strangers. We develop
15 relationships with local people and work with
16 them to build wells, clinic, schools and hope.

17 We have seen the results in
18 communities transformed. That's the kind of
19 Transformation that is needed and will make us
20 all safer. Thank you.

21 MR. BROWN: Alfred Meyer is next.

22 MS. MOHLING: DOE, nukes are so

1 over. We're just clinging, the Department of
2 Energy, NNSA, clings to the old ideas, and you
3 can understand why when you've heard all of
4 these people. My name is Judith MOHLING and
5 I'm from Boulder, Colorado. And I just want
6 to tell you a little about my history which
7 brought me here, right this minute. I was
8 born in Denver more than 70 years ago, and my
9 dad worked for the Atomic Energy Commission.
10 He was a geologist, head of the petrographic
11 labs of the reclamation, and they changed his
12 job, as were many scientist jobs changed to
13 the Atomic Energy Commission when those days
14 were upon us.

15 And he sat at the table at dinner
16 and warned my brother and me about nuclear
17 weapons and what a scourge they might be,
18 because that was like in the 40s, and what on
19 earth were we going to do with the waste. My
20 husband was a theoretical physicist and we, at
21 the University of Colorado, and we had a leave
22 of absence where we lived in Los Alamos in

1 Stan Ulam's house, if you remember the
2 mathematician of the Manhattan Project. And
3 I got to know him and other people. I knew
4 Frank Oppenheimer. So I was involved in that,
5 and I was intrigued by that.

6 And I, in fact, as an activist,
7 I've talked at a microphone at that lake, and
8 I can't remember the name of it, in Los
9 Alamos, and I could see where I lived. So it
10 was like little Judy's life was there before
11 me, and I totally come in the other direction.
12 We grew up with Rocky Flats and then I helped
13 to shut it down. Now, with the Rocky Mountain
14 Peace and Justice Center, I try to insist that
15 it be cleaned up properly, safely. And it
16 isn't. And the Department of Energy and the -
17 - what is the other agency? Want to make it
18 into a Wildlife Refuge, and we will do
19 everything possible to keep that from
20 happening because it's not clean.

21 And part of the legacy of Rocky
22 Flats is nuclear material, but it's all over

1 the state. Much of it was dumped illegally.
2 And now RNPJC that I work with is trying to
3 insist that that be cleaned up. It's not
4 under regulatory concern. So it's very, very
5 tricky. And now we're talking about more
6 nuclear weapons, and more of all the waste
7 that Colorado is such a perfect example of
8 having within its borders.

9 Also I have two kids, each of them
10 has -- one has one child, and the other, my
11 son, has two children, and the thought of
12 those children growing up with more new
13 nuclear weapons in a consolidated deal just
14 makes me vomit. Shanti and Scott, my daughter
15 and son-in-law, and Carmen, my granddaughter,
16 live in Taos where the parents are OB/GYNs.
17 And the thought of Lana producing more pits
18 makes me heart sick. Not only for my family
19 but for the whole world.

20 My view point is know the no-
21 production alternative for sure. And there is
22 a Buddhist idea that evil is attachment to

1 form. Evil is attachment to form. When you
2 hold onto a certain form and not let it change
3 and be flexible, and let fresh air come into
4 it, there is going to be harm, whether it's in
5 your own self, in your family, in the
6 community, or in the United States with the
7 Department of Energy and NNSA.

8 MR. BROWN: You have one minute
9 left.

10 MS. MOHLING: Oh my heavens! The
11 term "transformation" is really quite
12 prescient. It forecasts what we must do. We
13 must truly have a transformation. We don't
14 have a secure world. Developing more weapons
15 is going to increase the degradation of the
16 environment, and decrease our security even
17 more. We need to change the whole complex and
18 dismantle, clean up, and we need to guarantee
19 the workers who are there, who would put their
20 sweat, and many cases, their lives on the
21 line.

22 We need to guarantee them wages

1 and a safe life. The United States can and
2 must lead the world through a huge real
3 Transformation towards peaceful coexistence,
4 all nations using diplomacy and mediation for
5 all disputes. For heavens sake, we're mature
6 enough human beings, we can do that. It's not
7 rocket science to have people mediating with
8 each other instead of force and being the
9 imperial bully of the world. It's not rocket
10 science. It's not even as difficult as
11 nuclear science. Let's change NNSA to
12 National New Security Administration, no
13 nukes.

14 MR. BROWN: Thank you.

15 MS. MOHLING: Thank you.

16 MR. BROWN: Okay. Alfred Meyer.

17 Jonathan Ventura is next.

18 MR. MEYER: Good afternoon, my
19 name is Alfred Meyer and I'm the program
20 director of the Alliance for Nuclear
21 Accountability. My comments will specifically
22 address the idea of the no-production

1 alternative and in particular, the statements
2 in the draft, SPEIS, which say that they have
3 been eliminated from consideration. On page
4 S-57, the draft SPEIS lists suggested
5 alternatives that have been eliminated from
6 detailed study.

7 The alternative called, "pursue
8 dismantlement and refrain from designing and
9 building new nuclear weapons" is second on the
10 list of laminated alternatives. Representing
11 the Alliance for Nuclear Accountability and
12 it's 35-member organizations, I am here to
13 explain why the alternative that we call the
14 no-production alternative, must be studied in
15 detail if this NEPA process is to fulfill its
16 purpose.

17 The no-production alternative
18 represents a true transformation of the
19 complex. It will save money and protect the
20 environment. The no-production alternative
21 defines how the nuclear weapons complex should
22 be maintained. The purpose of this

1 alternative is to support dismantlement,
2 disposition of fissile and waste materials,
3 and environmental clean up.

4 Until all weapons are dismantled,
5 the complex will continue to certify the
6 remaining stock pile and monitor its safety,
7 security and reliability. The objective of
8 this alternative is curatorship of the
9 decreasing stockpile, instead of production of
10 new nuclear warheads. The no-production
11 alternative offers environmental consequences
12 which are significantly different than any of
13 the production based alternatives. It puts
14 major resources into dismantlement and clean
15 up. While at the same time, omitting new
16 weapons production, and the resulting
17 environmental pollution.

18 The combined effects will speed
19 the improvement of environmental public health
20 conditions and minimize any additional
21 environmental degradation. These are
22 significant, long-term consequences which

1 merit further study. The no-production
2 alternative is a reasonable alternative for
3 maintaining a safe, secure and reliable
4 nuclear weapons stock pile. The capability
5 based alternative has very different
6 environmental impacts. And thus, does not
7 substitute for the no-production alternative.
8 Given the results of the pit lifetime study
9 and the existing stockpile stewardship
10 programs, there is no evidence that
11 refurbished manufacturing facilities are
12 needed.

13 Furthermore, if the US and the
14 Department of Energy are genuinely working to
15 satisfy Article 6 of the Nuclear Non-
16 Proliferation Treaty, which is the legal
17 obligation for nuclear weapon states to reduce
18 and eliminate nuclear weapons, then the
19 nuclear weapons complex must be guided by the
20 only logical alternative, the no-production
21 alternative. I will provide a detailed
22 description of the no-production alternative

1 in written form accompanying this statement.

2 Thank you.

3 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay,
4 Jonathan Ventura, Tara Morrow will be after
5 Jonathan.

6 MR. VENTURA: Good afternoon, my
7 name is John Ventura. I am an employee of the
8 Los Alamos National Laboratory. My wife and
9 family reside in Los Alamos County, New
10 Mexico. I've worked on nuclear weapons my
11 entire professional career, and believe that
12 the preferred alternative as laid out by the
13 NNSA offers the nations many benefits and
14 should be included in the record of decision.
15 First, it provides a guide to prudently
16 consolidate the weapons complex in a manner
17 that is consistent with our security
18 challenges. Second, it will ensure the
19 continued scientific and technical excellence
20 of the laboratories.

21 These capabilities are applied not
22 only to supporting the nations nuclear

1 deterrent, but also help us in the areas of
2 reduction, non-proliferation, space
3 applications and basic science activities.
4 Finally, it positions the laboratories to
5 respond to unanticipated security challenges
6 that will confront the nation in the decades
7 to come. All these factors could allow the
8 United States to move to even lower stockpile
9 numbers than those required under the Moscow
10 Treaty. I'd also like to submit for the
11 record and independent survey done by a public
12 opinion strategist on the attitudes of the
13 state of New Mexico on nuclear weapons
14 activities.

15 The survey was conducted March 2
16 through 4 with 500 opinion leaders across the
17 state of New Mexico. Opinion leaders were
18 defined as registered voters who voted in the
19 previous election, and are likely to vote in
20 the next election. Among the findings, more
21 than 60 percent have positive feelings for the
22 work carried out by Los Alamos, and Sandia

1 National Laboratory, and 60 percent also
2 support the continued maintenance of a safe,
3 secure lab and nuclear deterrent to defend
4 ourselves from threats posed by China, Iran,
5 North Korea and other states.

6 Again, my thanks to Ted and his
7 colleagues for holding these public hearings
8 and encourage the need to include the
9 preferred alternative in the record of
10 decision later this year. Thank you.

11 MR. BROWN: Okay. Tara Morrow.
12 Anisa Visji will be next.

13 MS. MORROW: Thank you for the
14 opportunity to make public comment today. My
15 name is Tara Morrow and I'm on the staff of
16 Faith for Security, and national interfaith
17 coalition committed to the elimination of
18 nuclear weapons.

19 As a member of the United
20 Methodist Church, I'm reminded of the pastoral
21 letter and foundation document, "In Defense of
22 Creation: The Nuclear Crisis and a Just

1 Peace," from the United Methodist Council of
2 Bishops. It speaks to us today as it first
3 did in 1986. We say a clear and uncondition
4 no to nuclear war and to any use of nuclear
5 weapons. Deterrents is a position that cannot
6 receive the church's blessing. We state our
7 complete lack of confidence in proposed
8 defenses against nuclear attack, and are
9 convinced that the enormous cost of developing
10 such defenses is one more witness to the
11 obvious fact that the arms race is a social
12 justice issue, not only a war and peace issue.

13 The Council of Bishops reiterated
14 its position in 2005, and a resolution on the
15 60th anniversary of the atomic bombings of
16 Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Therefore, we urge
17 the governments of all nations developing or
18 possessing nuclear weaponry to stop further
19 development and to vow never again to use
20 their nuclear arsenals in a way of solving
21 international conflicts. Well, as an American
22 tax payer, I appreciate the dedication of the

1 Department of Energy employees in preparing
2 the draft Complex Transformation Supplemental
3 PEIS.

4 I stand here today in echo in
5 agreement the comment from the Friends
6 Committee on National Legislation, Faith for
7 Security, my own organizational, and 14 other
8 national religious groups. And their public
9 comments today as outlined by David Culp
10 earlier, they propose a no-production
11 alternative to complex transformation. This
12 would include the following steps: placing a
13 moratorium on new warhead designs, limiting
14 plutonium pit production to replacement of
15 pits destroyed by surveillance activities,
16 consolidating and downsizing the nuclear
17 weapons complex, and continuing the nuclear
18 testing moratorium.

19 Finally, as someone who's studied
20 physics as an undergraduate, with most of my
21 classmates going on to doctoral work in
22 physics and astrophysics, I will say that I

1 went on to study theology. But my classmates
2 who went on for their doctor work in the
3 field, and are now in their first years of
4 professional work, I appreciate the need to
5 "maintain core competencies" in any given
6 scientific field from generation to
7 generation. However, I cannot in this
8 instance, agree with spending untold billions
9 of dollars to keep scientists and others at
10 the ready. I especially cannot agree when the
11 same great scientific intellect could be
12 redirected to meet pressing demands such as
13 alternative fuels, and increased energy
14 efficiency which indeed have national security
15 implications. Thank you.

16 MR. BROWN: Anisa will be followed
17 by Patricia Anton.

18 MS. VISJI: Good afternoon, my
19 name is Anisa Visji and I'm representing the
20 American Friends Service Committee's
21 Washington Public Policy Office. The AFSC is
22 a Quaker-based organization that works with

1 peace, justice, and reconciliation as a
2 recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize. Our peace
3 and economic security program has wrought a US
4 nuclear weapons policy since the late 1970s
5 including work on launching the Nuclear
6 Weapons Freeze Movement, that moved the
7 government to negotiate the intermediate
8 Nuclear Process Treaty, and played a powerful
9 role in ending the Cold War.

10 I come before you today to urge
11 that the Department of Energy and National
12 Nuclear Security Administration take no action
13 to actualize the Complex Transformation
14 proposal. It is a misconceived and dangerous
15 proposal that would increase rather than
16 reduce the dangers of nuclear war. And I
17 believe we can all agree today that nuclear
18 war will, indeed, negatively impact the
19 environment.

20 The Nobel Laureate and former
21 Manhattan Project senior scientist, Dr. Joseph
22 Rotblat taught that because no nation will

1 long tolerate what it experiences as a
2 threatening and unjust imbalance of terror,
3 humanity faces a stark choice. Either
4 negotiate the elimination of the world's
5 nuclear arsenals as provided by the NPT and
6 Congress, even General Assembly Resolutions,
7 of faith global proliferation of nuclear
8 weapons, and the nuclear wars that will
9 inevitably follow.

10 In part, due to the refusal of our
11 government and the other declared nuclear
12 powers, to fulfill their NPT Article 6
13 obligations, India, Pakistan, and more
14 recently North Korea have become declared
15 nuclear powers. And we have reason to fear
16 that Iran and other nations will follow suit
17 in years to come. The IAEA director, General
18 Mohammad El Baredai, had repeatedly reminded
19 us that the hypocrisy, the double standards of
20 the nuclear powers, is the most subversive
21 force undermining the Nuclear Non-
22 proliferation Treaty order.

1 By proceeding with Complex
2 Transformation, our government will be sending
3 the message that we have no respect for the
4 NPT Article 6 obligations. That preparations
5 and threats to initiate genocidal or omnicidal
6 nuclear war remain the cornerstone of our
7 policies as evident in a really long list of
8 US first strike threats that I will be
9 submitting with this testimony. And that if
10 nations seek to rectify the terrorizing
11 imbalance of terror, they should seriously
12 consider unconventional warfare of becoming
13 nuclear weapons states themselves.

14 So please for the sake of the
15 security of the United States, and other
16 peoples around the world, we urge that you not
17 go forward with the Complex Transformation.
18 Doing so is essential to the pursuit of
19 nuclear non-proliferation, and to the ultimate
20 achievement of nuclear weapons abolition.
21 Thank you for your consideration.

22 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Patricia

1 Anton and Susan Gordon will be after her.

2 MS. ANTON: My name is Patricia
3 Anton. I am the coordinator for the Muslim-
4 Christian initiative on the nuclear weapons
5 danger. A partnership between two
6 organizations who are signatories to the joint
7 religious statement presented by David Culp
8 and signed by 14 national religious
9 organizations.

10 The Muslim-Christian initiative is
11 actually a dialogue based partnership that has
12 developed a statement calling for the
13 elimination of nuclear weapons. The unique
14 nature of this program is that I don't spend
15 a lot of time talking about nuclear weapons or
16 doing so much advocacy, but I do get to spend
17 a lot of time in congregations listening to
18 people. And I'm surprised always to find how
19 much at the congregational level people have
20 to say, and how deeply they feel about this
21 issue, because it touches into questions of
22 what we understand about existence and about

1 life itself. And you find that people feel
2 very deeply about this.

3 And what I've found is that there
4 are themes that are consistent. That People,
5 themselves, bring up at every dialogue that we
6 have, and that is that nuclear weapons are an
7 unacceptable risk for humanity, and for the
8 rest of the planet, and that they're immoral
9 because they do not discriminate between the
10 combatants and between innocents, and because
11 they cause the irreparable damage to the
12 environment.

13 Also that there is the enormous
14 resources that are spent on nuclear weapons
15 can be used for better purposes. So without
16 further elaborations on these points, I would
17 just like to affirm the joint religious
18 statement calling for the no-production
19 alternative to the Complex Transformation.
20 Thank you.

21 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Susan will
22 be followed by Krista Brewer.

1 MS. GORDON: My name is Susan
2 Gordon. I'm the director of the Alliance for
3 Nuclear Accountability, which is a national
4 network of 35 organizations that have been
5 working collaboratively for 20 years on
6 nuclear weapons production and waste issues.
7 Most of our community groups are based next
8 door to the nuclear weapons complex sites that
9 are very much impacted by what goes on at
10 those facilities.

11 I have -- this is my fifth hearing
12 that I'm testifying at. So Ted and Holmes and
13 us, you know, we're buds. So there are a
14 number of things that I want to address that
15 haven't come up previously.

16 First, we would like to call for
17 an extension, a 90 day extension on the
18 comment period. I think that with the
19 complexity of the documents, and the interest
20 that it's being shown around the country that
21 it's important that more of the public be
22 included with the opportunity to comment on

1 these documents. I want to raise the issue
2 that the original record of decision coming
3 out of the 1996 Stockpile Stewardship and
4 Management Program, when it was looking in
5 evaluation alternatives at that point the
6 drastic transformation that's being proposed
7 right now was not even conceived of in that
8 document. And it did not propose a wide range
9 of production facilities.

10 So the fact that this supplemental
11 programmatic environmental impact statement is
12 based on a 10 year old document, I think
13 raises into question whether it is an adequate
14 document to start the discussion from.

15 Another piece that is missing from the current
16 supplemental programmatic environmental impact
17 statement is the lack of any reference to the
18 Kansas City plant.

19 The Kansas City plant was key in
20 the `96 record of decision. It's been
21 completely eliminated from this document. And
22 they are planning to spend \$500 million

1 dollars of privatized money to build a new
2 weapons facility, manufacturing plant in
3 Kansas City, and I think that has to be
4 included in this document. It cannot be
5 removed.

6 Several people have spoken to the
7 number of comments that were received
8 previously supporting the Non-Proliferation
9 Treaty and adherence to that. In my
10 calculations over the last couple of days, I
11 believe there are more than 50,000 comments
12 that have come in. Do you think we're close
13 to that? Lets keep going. And I guess I want
14 to say that this is a national referendum on
15 this policy, and that's why we need to extend
16 the comment period, and that's why it's just
17 not acceptable, what is being proposed at this
18 point.

19 Many people have spoken to the new
20 nuclear non -- I'm sorry. The new nuclear
21 posture review, and those other issues, and I,
22 you know, reiterate that they're very

1 important reasons and I don't want to go into
2 it specifically. I do want to raise and
3 issue, though, and that is having sat through
4 all of these hearings, you know, I am really
5 concerned that the Los Alamos lab has
6 contracted with Burson Marsteller or its
7 affiliate to do public relations work around
8 the Complex Transformation proposal. And to
9 be hiring a PR firm to encourage workers
10 within the complex to come and speak at these
11 hearings, you know, great public
12 participation. But are they spending tax
13 payer money? Did LANL hire a PR firm to, you
14 know, to advocate their position. Are they so
15 threatened because they know this policy, this
16 concept is so outdated that they have to do
17 that kind of approach. It's very interesting,
18 and I think that, you know, it deserves quite
19 a bit more analysis.

20 MR. BROWN: You have a minute
21 left.

22 MS. GORDON: Great. Another thing

1 that I want to point out is the cute little
2 map that's on here that shows the nuclear
3 weapons complex over the past 28 years. It
4 fails to recognize that at the height of the
5 Cold War there were over 600 facilities in
6 this country involved in the production of
7 nuclear weapons. They didn't just disappear,
8 those sites. Many of them have been closed.
9 But they weren't cleaned up. Some of these
10 that are on here, which you know, conveniently
11 disappear from here to there, are still part
12 of the Department of Energy's nuclear weapons
13 complex sites.

14 The fiscal year `09 request states
15 that there is a need for \$300 billion dollars
16 to clean up these sites. That's more than
17 what's being proposed in terms of the Complex
18 Transformation. They didn't happily go away.
19 They're still there and it needs to be cleaned
20 up. And that should be, I think, the focus of
21 what Complex Transformation should be. No
22 disposition, dismantlement of the nuclear

1 weapons, and cleaning up the communities,
2 taking care of the workers who have been
3 contaminated, and poisoned, and killed, and
4 those communities, and the people of those
5 communities that live next to those sites.
6 Thank you.

7 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Krista
8 Brewer, and Katherine Fuchs is next.

9 MS. BREWER: My name is Krista
10 Brewer. I am president of the Atlanta Georgia
11 Chapter of Women's Action for New Directions.
12 As earlier speaker, Kristina Chernansky said,
13 WAND was formed about 26 years ago as Women's
14 Action for Nuclear Disarmament. When the Cold
15 War ended, our organization felt that there
16 was going to be -- that nuclear weapons, we
17 were going to disarm nuclear weapons. We were
18 going to become obsolete, and WAND changed
19 their name to Women's Action for New
20 Directions. We thought we were going to be
21 moving in a new direction and that there would
22 be a peace dividend that we could use for

1 purposes to benefit humans and environmental
2 needs.

3 Unfortunatly and sadly, we are
4 still here these 26 years later from the
5 founding of WAND, still talking about nuclear
6 weapons and possibly building up more nuclear
7 weapons. I attended the very first hearing in
8 North Augusta, which is near the Savannah
9 River site. Atlanta WAND has long followed
10 the issues around Savannah River site. And
11 it's one of the potential sites being
12 considered for additional nuclear production
13 under Complex Transformation.

14 I wanted to come to this hearing
15 in my nation's capital to be a voice for those
16 who are living near nuclear weapons sites and
17 will be effected by the changes. I come as a
18 mother of three. I'm concerned about the
19 ultimate threat to our existence, that of
20 nuclear weapons. I fear for my children, and
21 for all unborn. Savannah River site
22 specifically, is currently host for tritium

1 extraction facility, and that won't go away.
2 We will still be doing that at the Savannah
3 River site. Tritium is a particularly
4 dangerous substance because it can cross the
5 placenta and it causes birth defects.

6 Tritium has been found in the
7 river, Savannah River, which Savannah River
8 site borders. We have a small community down
9 river of Savannah River site, Keysville, where
10 one of our members actually lives. Tritium
11 has been found in their well water. They had
12 to install a city water system and stop using
13 their wells because of the tritium in the
14 water. The latest plan which used to be, as
15 we know, used to be Complex 2030, which I also
16 testified against, is based, as many of you
17 have said, on the administration's seven year
18 old nuclear posture review.

19 I, as some of you have also urged,
20 to wait until we have a new president to put
21 this plan on hold, to not spend anymore of our
22 tax payer dollars examining this complex

1 transformation. It is important, I think, to
2 be reminded of the actual size of our current
3 nuclear arsenal. At the first hearing in
4 North Augusta, I did a demonstration to give
5 everybody an idea of the size of our current
6 nuclear arsenal. And in that demonstration,
7 which some of you have probably seen, I used
8 bee-bees. I was a little daunted by the idea
9 of getting bee-bees on the airplane, bringing
10 them through the security here, so I thought
11 I would just mentioned how that demonstration
12 works.

13 I dropped one bee-bee into a big
14 bucket. One bee-bee represents six bombs the
15 size that we dropped on Hiroshima. Then I
16 dropped six bee-bees, that is enough nuclear
17 power to blow up all of Russia. Then into the
18 bucket I dropped bee-bees that represent our
19 entire nuclear arsenal. The sound of the bee-
20 bees falling into the bucket goes on and on
21 and on. It's 10,000 bee-bees. 10,000 bee-
22 bees represent 150,000 Hiroshima sized bombs.

1 That is the size of our nuclear arsenal right
2 now.

3 MR. BROWN: You've got one minute
4 left.

5 MS. BREWER: Okay. Why do we need
6 so many nuclear bombs. It costs us tax payers
7 \$17.6 billion dollars per year just to
8 maintain these weapons and their delivery
9 systems. Think about what we could do with
10 \$17.6 billion if we did not have these nuclear
11 weapons. Could we have better schools, better
12 healthcare for children, safer ports, more
13 money for cleanup of old nuclear weapons
14 sites. I want to thank you for the
15 opportunity of letting me speak in North
16 Augusta and here today. And thank you for
17 holding these hearings all around the country.
18 But I urge DOE to listen to the thousands of
19 comments that you've already gotten urging no
20 buildup of our nuclear arsenal. And I'm
21 hoping and Atlanta WAND, and our national
22 organization, WAND, is all hoping that

1 eventually we have a total abolition of all
2 nuclear weapons. Thank you.

3 MR. BROWN: Thank you. After
4 Katherine, Rosemary Ann Blanchard will speak.

5 MS. FUCHS: Hi, I'm Katherine
6 Fuchs, and I work with Peace Action. Today
7 I'm here representing more than 100,000 Peace
8 Action members across the country, some of
9 whom live in areas directly affected by the
10 nuclear complex, including New Mexico, Nevada,
11 California, Texas, and Kansas City. Our
12 members in Kansas City were not so privileged
13 to have a hearing in their area. So hopefully
14 I can speak for them.

15 We also have 12,000 -- more than
16 12,000 members who have already submitted
17 comments and hopefully more will be submitting
18 them before the final date. For 50 years
19 Peace Action has been working to create a more
20 peaceful and secure world for all of us.
21 Primarily through nuclear abolition. And
22 that's why I'm here to speak in favor of a

1 non-production alternative.

2 Peace Action does support the
3 NNSA's goals of a smaller and safer nuclear
4 weapons complex. But we disagree that the
5 preferred alternative would be the best way to
6 serve these goals. We support the idea of
7 closing old buildings, particularly buildings
8 that may have safety hazards. And just, you
9 know, be falling apart. We support the idea
10 of consolidating special nuclear materials.
11 The more places they are, the more danger we
12 are in that they could be stolen and then
13 fallen into the hands of terrorists.

14 But we do not support the
15 establishment of another plutonium pit
16 production facility. Given that both houses
17 of Congress have recently put the kibash on
18 the Reliable Replacement Warheads Plan and
19 cited that we do not, in fact, need new
20 nuclear weapons, given that the JASON study
21 recently said that our current arsenal will be
22 safe and reliable for minimally another 70

1 years, neither I nor any of my fellow tax
2 payers who I've discussed Complex
3 Transformation with have been able to find any
4 reason to invest millions of dollars in
5 another -- in the CMR or another pit
6 production facility.

7 Peace Action recommends that the
8 NNSA spend more energy investigating what went
9 wrong at Rocky Flats than trying to resurrect
10 a new Rocky Flats. If the goal of the DOE is
11 to make Americans safer and more secure, we
12 propose a non-production alternative that
13 would atone for past health and environmental
14 affects of US nuclear weapons research,
15 production and disposal. If the goal of the
16 DOE is to make Americans safer and more
17 secure, we propose that they enact a non-
18 production alternative that would provide
19 global leadership on our Non-proliferation
20 Treaty, Article 6, obligation to disarm.

21 If the goal of the DOE is to make
22 Americans safer and more secure, we suggest

1 going with a non-production alternative that
2 would look into green energy solutions and
3 other problems that we're facing with our
4 current climate crisis. In short, Peace
5 Action recommends that we go with a non-
6 production alternative that would make
7 Americans safer and more secure.

8 I really appreciate the
9 opportunity to speak here today as part of
10 this PEIS process. And I very much look
11 forward to continuing my work with Congress
12 and the next administration to make a safer
13 and more secure nuclear policy that includes
14 dismantlement and not more pit production.

15 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Mark
16 Lubrig will be after Rosemary.

17 MS. BLANCHARD: Thank you very
18 much. My name is Rosemary Blanchard and I'm
19 a little bit migratory. I live in
20 Albuquerque, New Mexico, and yet I'm on the
21 faculty of California State University at
22 Sacramento where I teach in the field of

1 educational leadership. And actually have
2 some background from both those perspectives
3 that I want to contribute to this hearing.

4 From the New Mexico side of it, oh
5 my gosh is this a bad idea. It's just sort of
6 how do you count the ways. And I'm down river
7 from Los Alamos, so is my daughter, so is my
8 son-in-law, so is my baby grandson. Being
9 down river from Los Alamos is quite an
10 experience. I have worked with and
11 represented native peoples from the Navajo
12 nation and the various Pueblos in that area,
13 many of whom have relatives who died from the
14 mining of uranium that was done so carelessly.

15 We have been a national sacrifice
16 area long enough. And we're tired of it. And
17 this plan is again seeking to make that part
18 of the United States a national sacrifice
19 area. Doing more with the Nevada test site is
20 once again, restoring it to being a national
21 sacrifice area. Expanding production at Los
22 Alamos when there is so much problem, there

1 are so many problems already at Los Alamos,
2 with the damage that's been done there, with
3 the degradation to the land that's been done
4 there, how do I know when I am not a nuclear
5 physicist? Because I saw how hysterical the
6 nuclear physicists and the energy lab folks
7 became in 2000 when the big Los Alamos fire
8 threatened the lab and burned down some
9 arroyos where there were waste stored. And
10 White Rock was evacuated even when White Rock
11 wasn't immediately threatened by the fire.

12 It was obvious there was more to
13 burn than trees in that area. Now if you wash
14 down the arroyos, you wash them down into the
15 Rio Grande. And the Rio Grande goes down
16 through the heart of New Mexico, down through
17 my beloved Albuquerque, down to past El Paso
18 and down into the Gulf of Mexico. Do you
19 realize how many places to pollute there are
20 along the Rio Grande. And in fact, your plan
21 is not a plan that includes how to keep that
22 fragile watershed safe.

1 Bottom line, it is not a plan how
2 to keep that fragile watershed safe. The
3 mining of uranium in New Mexico has never kept
4 our watersheds safe. I had the good fortune
5 to learn that, thanks to the bad fortune of
6 the Navajo people when I saw an official
7 report down water from where the Church Rock
8 uranium spill took place. Telling traditional
9 Navajo ranchers and farmers that they could
10 grow their sheep but they probably better not
11 eat them because they were radioactive.

12 To this day, that spill is not
13 cleaned up. Los Alamos is up on a mesa with
14 arroyos going down toward the Rio Grande. In
15 addition, the plan for Los Alamos calls for a
16 more efficient and effective use of water.
17 Friends, we are going into a 500 year drought
18 in the Southwest. You know what? We don't
19 have very much water in the Southwest.

20 I want to make one point in my one
21 minute about non-proliferation. I was doing
22 a piece of research for the paper I just gave

1 the American Education Research Association
2 annual meeting. And no reason to know why,
3 but I happen to look at the diplomatic record
4 of the Diplomatic Conference of Geneva, of
5 1949. And there, right in front of me, was a
6 lost opportunity for non-proliferation. As we
7 were negotiating the Geneva Conventions, the
8 USSR and many of its client nations wanted
9 something in the Geneva Conventions that would
10 say that extermination of civilian populations
11 was against the Fourth Geneva Conventions.

12 Obviously, they were thinking of
13 Hiroshima, Nagasaki. The United States
14 objected to that language because it got in
15 the way of our nuclear policy. The
16 conventions were approved without that
17 language on August 15, 1949. And the Soviet
18 Union tested their first weapon on August 29,
19 1949. And we haven't learned a thing since
20 then.

21 We fostered proliferation of
22 weapons then. We are fostering proliferation

1 of weapons now. When are we going to learn?

2 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay,
3 Mark. Kevin Kamps will follow Mark.

4 MR. GUBRUD: I'm Mark Gubrud. I'm
5 a laboratory scientist taking a break today
6 from choosing components to loose in a low
7 temperature scanning, tunneling nanomicroscope
8 up at the University of Maryland. Complex
9 Transformation in all of its flavors of the no
10 action proposal is a proposal to renew the
11 United States commitment to nuclear weapons,
12 possessing nuclear weapons, and threatening to
13 use them by renewing the complex for producing
14 and maintaining them.

15 Alternatives to this proposal
16 range from simply shutting down all production
17 and maintenance activities, and beginning
18 dismantlement. Two, auditing the existing
19 complex to operate while we seek a global
20 convention eliminating and banning nuclear
21 weapons. Now, I want to present alternatives
22 to this, which other people have spoken here

1 about ranging -- well, as I said, the whole
2 host of alternatives to those that have been
3 laid out in the plan that I've been seeing.
4 But I wanted to speak to the environmental
5 impact statement and to its inadequacies,
6 because it is inadequate.

7 I would think that an
8 environmental impact statement ought to make
9 a credible statement about the environmental
10 impact of the proposal. And the environmental
11 impact of the Complex Transformation proposals
12 really fall into three categories, in my
13 opinion. In each of which has two sides. The
14 domestic side, which results directly from
15 what we do here, and the international side,
16 which results from what other nations do in
17 response. So the impacts are really global,
18 and they're really, you know, they're two-
19 sided. They're what we do, and they're what
20 other people do as a result of what we do.

21 And I think the first and
22 potentially, or possibly the most important

1 environmental impact relates to the fact that
2 nuclear weapons, by their mere existence,
3 pollute our world. Because they mean that the
4 political order that we live under, the
5 governing structure that we live under
6 internationally is founded on threats of
7 genocide, and the hatred that must -- that
8 must represent. The threat to commit genocide
9 in an unprecedented scale.

10 Children have to grow up trying to
11 understand how this can be, and facing, you
12 know, the possibility that their entire world
13 could be wiped out. That they, themselves,
14 killed and everything that they know. As
15 adults, we have to live with the threat that
16 everything that we value could be destroyed
17 from ourselves, our families, civilization,
18 nature. This is, I think, a fundamental
19 pollution of the world that we live in.

20 Now, the second broad impact is
21 the threat of nuclear war that is created or
22 in other words, the impact that these actions

1 will have, the US policy in renewing our
2 commitment to nuclear weapons will have in
3 terms of increasing the likelihood that
4 nuclear weapons will be used somewhere in the
5 world and possibly catastrophically. That was
6 not assessed in this statement. And the third
7 broad area is of simply the release of
8 radioactive materials and pollutants into the
9 environment. And again, we have to consider
10 not only the spanking new complex which may be
11 built here, which might be better run and
12 safer, and cleaner than the past complex, or
13 it wouldn't be too hard to beat the record of
14 the nuclear weapons complex in the past, but
15 with it we also need to consider the
16 activities of other nations in responding and
17 the lower standards for environmental
18 protection that will be in effect in other
19 states that respond to the United States,
20 renewing its commitment to nuclear weapons.
21 Building a new nuclear weapons production
22 complex and continuing this activity in the

1 future.

2 So I don't think that any of that
3 was really adequately addressed in the
4 environmental impact statement that has been
5 prepared to date, and I would call for an
6 environmental impact statement that actually
7 addresses the real environmental impacts of
8 this proposal.

9 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay,
10 Kevin. Emily Zaebst will be after Kevin.

11 MR. KAMPS: Thanks. I'd like to
12 thank the NNSA and the DOE for hosting this
13 hearing, and for this opportunity to speak.
14 I really learned a lot today. My name is
15 Kevin Kamps. I'm with Beyond Nuclear, which
16 is a new organization. We formed in June
17 2007. And I do the radioactive waste work at
18 beyond nuclear. And for most of my career in
19 activism and in the nuclear field, I've been
20 focused on nuclear power, the commercial side
21 of the coin, and especially the radioactive
22 waste issue. And I'm reminded of some long

1 DOE hearings having to do deal with Yucca
2 Mountain, and this has been a long one today
3 as well. But I remember at one hearing the
4 western Shoshone spiritual leader, Corbin
5 Harney, who recently passed away, appeared to
6 be asleep in the back of the room. And it was
7 well after midnight at this point, and the
8 hearing had gone on for many hours. And a
9 moderator asked, I don't remember if you were
10 there, the moderator asked if anyone had
11 anything to say, and Corbin was not asleep,
12 and he went up to the microphone. And what he
13 had to say was, "If you DOEs want to destroy
14 a planet, don't make it this one. Why don't
15 you go to Mars and do it."

16 So Corbin devoted his entire life,
17 his long life, to protecting western Shoshone
18 homelands in Nevada. But to protecting the
19 whole world, the air and the water, the soil
20 and the planet. And a big part of his work
21 was bringing nuclear weapons testing to an end
22 in Nevada, and trying to stop the Yucca

1 Mountain dump from opening as well. So it's
2 good to remember him today.

3 I can't add to many of the
4 powerful and eloquent statements that my
5 colleagues made already from the Peace, and
6 Social Justice, and environmental and
7 religious groups, and movements. But I did
8 have a few thoughts I wanted to share. When
9 nuclear weapons kind of exploded on my world,
10 I think I was in 7th grade in science class.
11 And my teacher, my science teacher had a
12 bulletin board, and I was minding my own
13 business over by the bulleting board and
14 happened to read a news article that he had
15 posted up there.

16 In Michigan, from the Kalamazoo
17 Gazette, a professor at Western Michigan
18 University, a physics professor, wrote about
19 what would happen to Kalamazoo if there were
20 a nuclear exchange between the Soviet Union
21 and the United States, and this was in the
22 early 80s. And because a factory nearby made

1 a single part of a missile engine that would
2 be used in nuclear missiles, the Soviets
3 likely had targeted our area with a 20 megaton
4 nuclear warhead. So you know, hypothesizing
5 that the nuclear warhead were to explode over
6 Bronson Park and downtown Kalamazoo, he
7 described the effects at various distances.

8 And needless to say, that made
9 quite an impression on my young mind. And I
10 was interested in these issues. And that's
11 why it's important for my organization to put
12 its full support behind the no-production
13 alternative that's been so well described
14 today. It's really time to move on from this
15 nightmarish episode in human history. And the
16 thought of dodging bullets came to mind as I
17 listened to people speak today. And it may be
18 true that many bullets have been dodged.

19 The speaker from the American
20 Friends Service Committee mentioned that there
21 have been, perhaps as many as 40 instances in
22 history where nuclear weapons use was

1 explicitly threatened, and this doesn't
2 include Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This was
3 after that. And the book that really
4 chronicles this is Joseph Gerson's "Empire and
5 the Bomb" which recently came out.

6 So in that sense, humanity,
7 perhaps, has been lucky. But of course, there
8 are many people and other beings that have not
9 dodged bullets in the atomic age. And
10 Hiroshima and Nagasaki are first on that list.
11 But there are tens, to hundreds of thousands,
12 perhaps millions of Americans who have died
13 from radioactive fallout, downwind and
14 downstream of not only nuclear weapons
15 testing, but as a recent speaker said, but
16 simply the mining of uranium and the
17 processing of it.

18 MR. BROWN: One minute left.

19 MR. KAMPS: So it's high time to
20 stop playing Russian roulette with atomic
21 warheads. And I would point out that another
22 recent study by scientists like Robock at

1 Rutgers has found that even a limited exchange
2 of nuclear warheads, 50 warheads exchanged
3 between India and Pakistan would be enough to
4 plunge the Earth into a nuclear winter that
5 would end civilization as we know it through
6 major disruptions of agriculture and
7 widespread famine.

8 And I will just close by
9 mentioning another book called "By the Bombs
10 Early Light." That was a look at what
11 happened in the United States after Hiroshima
12 and Nagasaki. And there was an initial
13 euphoria at the end of the war. But
14 immediately, and within days after that
15 initial euphoria, there was a widespread fear
16 and realization that this very same thing
17 could happen here. And that kind of defeated
18 the purpose of World War II, I would say.

19 So it's high time for the United
20 States to provide true leadership in the
21 world, and abolish nuclear weapons. And this
22 proposal is in the wrong direction for

1 accomplishing that. Thank you.

2 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay,
3 Emily will be followed by Jon Rainwater.

4 MS. ZAEBST: I would like to start
5 out by thanking all of you who are here that
6 have worked so hard to keep people like myself
7 and my daughter safe with your efforts. My
8 name is Emily Zaebst. My daughter and I are
9 here from Cincinnati. I'm a mother and a
10 nurse. Cincinnati is conveniently located
11 between Piketon and Fernald. I'm sure you're
12 aware of those places. I'm here because I
13 need to express that I am totally opposed to
14 the Complex Transformation. It is not safe
15 for me, for my family, any of our children, or
16 any of the generations to come.

17 It is irresponsible, and its
18 unjust for you to continue to develop greater
19 numbers of nuclear weapons. It is not
20 possible this will improve anyone's safety,
21 but rather, the very opposite. I'm opposed to
22 your investing anymore of our tax money to the

1 increasing the storage of nuclear waste. I'm
2 opposed to your continuing to create nuclear
3 weapons developed with the intent to not only
4 intimidate others into submission, but to
5 actually massacre human beings.

6 These weapons not only kill the
7 bad guys, but they slaughter grandmothers, and
8 babies, and school children. This is entirely
9 unacceptable. We need to invest our tax money
10 into securing peace through more effective
11 means that nuclear weapons. Means that
12 reflect our American values of human life and
13 dignity. This money would be better spent
14 dealing with all of the nuclear waste that we
15 have already created, instead of indefinitely
16 storing it in places like Piketon.

17 Listen, no mother, no healthcare
18 practitioner could reasonably support the DOE's
19 plan that continues to endanger the lives of
20 all citizens of this planet with the increased
21 number of nuclear weapons. My daughter has
22 two sentences that she has prepared and has

1 been thinking about it, and I hope that you
2 can listen to her, because this impacts her
3 more than any of us. She will be around a lot
4 longer, and she's going to have children, that
5 you know, maybe will have children someday,
6 friends that are on this planet a lot longer
7 than any of us. So I hope you can --

8 SERENITY ZAEBST: I think we need
9 to stop acting like preschoolers and think
10 about our actions and what we're doing to the
11 environment, and ourselves, because we are
12 hurting ourselves and the environment.

13 MS. ZAEBST: Thank you.

14 MR. BROWN: Let the record show
15 sustained applause. Next speaker is Jon
16 Rainwater.

17 MR. RAINWATER: I would have to
18 follow that. That's a tough act to follow.
19 A lot has been said and throughout this
20 process, and so I will be amplifying some of
21 the things said. I'm Jon Rainwater, Executive
22 Director of Peace Action West. And wanted to

1 thank Mr. Wyka and all of the DOE staff for
2 helping provide the opportunity for public
3 comment.

4 Our organization has engaged our
5 members who have sent in over, I think it's
6 over 7,000 comments. And there is a real
7 hunger out there for the American people to
8 participate in this process. And I also want
9 to suggest that public comment be extended.
10 This is a critical, critical project for this
11 country, and the future of this country in
12 many ways. And I really strongly urge
13 extending the public comment period.

14 When we talk to members of the
15 public, they are very eager to engage in this.
16 And I wanted to focus in my comment today on
17 some of the things that I hear from the
18 members of the public out there. There are
19 three very commonsensical responses to Complex
20 Transformation that are deeply -- seen as deep
21 flaws in this process, maybe fatal flaws. And
22 the first one is the process itself, that this

1 Complex Transformation plan does not come out
2 after a thorough going public debate about
3 nuclear weapons policy, an effort by Congress,
4 by the public, by the administration to look
5 at nuclear weapons policy. It just sort of
6 pops out, and there are documents referred to
7 in the notice of intent.

8 Speakers have talked about the
9 nuclear posture review, which again is just a
10 report to Congress. That is a very slim read
11 upon which to place this whole thing. So
12 again, commonsense says we need a debate
13 first. We need to look at the security
14 environment first before we commit to this.
15 And to refer a little bit to the nuclear
16 posture view, what are the threats that it
17 talks about? It talks about in very vague
18 terms a number of kind of threats that this
19 response of infrastructure that is at the
20 heart of Complex Transformation is based upon
21 threats like unanticipated events, adverse
22 changes in the geopolitical threat

1 environment. Innovations by an adversary, and
2 threats not yet materialized.

3 These are the threats that Complex
4 Transformation is designed to deal with. But
5 they are not truly detailed. It's always good
6 to look at unanticipated threats, but then to
7 go in and lock in hundreds of billions of
8 dollars project based on those threats, again,
9 stretches credulity, and is opposed to
10 commonsense. And that's what we hear from our
11 membership.

12 Basing this program, and the
13 thrust of DOE's nuclear weapons effort on
14 those threats, another commonsense problem
15 with that is it doesn't go towards what we all
16 know are the number one threats that we're
17 facing. We're dealing with nuclear terrorism,
18 as many experts have pointed out. Horizontal
19 nuclear proliferation. And we need to develop
20 strategies to meet our Non-proliferation
21 Treaty commitment in order to deal with both
22 of those threats. Everyone knows, I think, in

1 this room, that those are the number one
2 threats we face. Yet, these imagined threats
3 in the future are what this program is based
4 upon.

5 It doesn't make sense from a
6 commonsense standpoint. And it expands the
7 nuclear weapons complex in many ways to deal
8 with a much more sort of open ended threat
9 environment that doesn't make a lot of sense.
10 And if you look at Complex Transformation, or
11 take a look at the DOE budget, we see what's
12 not happening as speakers have said, which is
13 a new vision that responds to the real
14 environment out there and really shifts the
15 priorities of the Department of Energy to meet
16 the things that we all need as a country.

17 Everybody in this room, again, is
18 united in wanting their families to be safe.
19 And wanting the country to be safe. But this
20 plan, or frankly the DOE's priorities do not
21 meet the new challenges that we face as a
22 nation, and that is unfortunate. As it's been

1 --

2 MR. BROWN: You have one minute
3 left.

4 MR. RAINWATER: -- pointed out,
5 the policy basis for this plan not only goes
6 against the tens of thousands of comments, but
7 Congress acting over and over again against
8 this type of approach. What is the policy
9 basis for this plan? It goes against
10 everything that's been debated. It goes
11 against a renewed effort to actually eliminate
12 nuclear weapons in civil society. It goes
13 against the pronouncements of many
14 presidential campaigns. This is not the time
15 for this plan.

16 Instead, what it does is lock us
17 in to a plan for hundreds of billions of
18 dollars to be spent on an outmoded way of
19 looking at the world. Instead, lets unleash
20 the creativity of the DOE to deal with the
21 real challenges that we face, to including not
22 only nuclear terrorism, and non-proliferation,

1 but as some of the speakers have said, climate
2 change. Those are the threats that we face.
3 Lets take -- have a different vision in place,
4 and most importantly, we need to look at the
5 no-production alternative because that is the
6 alternative that meets our real security
7 needs.

8 To fail to look at that after tens
9 of thousands of comments indicating that's a
10 direction should be looked at, and given what
11 Congress has done, and everything else, is
12 again, a fundamental flaw in this plan, and we
13 need to change that. Thank you.

14 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Okay, our
15 next speaker is the Reverend Joseph Nangle.

16 MR. NANGLE: Thank you. Good
17 afternoon. My name is Father Joseph Nangle.
18 I'm a member of Pax-Christi USA which is the
19 Catholic Peace Movement in this country and
20 across the world. And I'm grateful for the
21 opportunity to speak on this very important
22 matter. It's pretty clear that the Catholic

1 church, especially the universal church, has
2 been very clear on its opposition to nuclear
3 weapons. Particularly in the last 30, 20
4 years.

5 John Paul, Pope John Paul offered
6 a conditioned moral acceptance of nuclear
7 deterrence only as an interim measure on the
8 path to nuclear disarmament, and then more
9 recently, representatives of the Vatican at
10 the UN have spoken very clearly about the
11 moral unacceptability. There can be no moral
12 acceptance of military doctrines that embody
13 the permanence of nuclear weapons that was
14 said by Monsignor Chilicott, who was a deputy
15 representative from the Vatican at the UN in
16 2005. And other representatives spoke about
17 this question in much the same terms. So the
18 church has been quite clear on this issue.
19 When we compare that to the United States
20 policy, there is a distinct difference.

21 In 1996, the United States
22 embarked on a \$60 billion reinvestment program

1 in its nuclear complex. And then more
2 recently we have the Complex Transformation,
3 what we're speaking about today. As much as
4 \$150 billion dollars over the next ten years
5 to ensure the viability of our nuclear
6 deterrent. Where does it end? Where does it
7 end?

8 So in the name of our organization
9 and I'm sure so many others who have spoken
10 today, 142 US Catholic Bishop members in the
11 country, 650 Catholic religious communities,
12 350 local Pax-Christi chapters across the
13 United States, and tens of thousands of
14 ordinary citizens and members of Pax-Christi,
15 we hope that the time is now to turn this
16 policy around.

17 Nuclear weapons are incompatible
18 with the peace we seek in the 21st century.
19 I'd like to inject a very personal note here.
20 Part of what the written testimony says is
21 that this spending on nuclear weapons, as on
22 all weapons, is a theft, theft from billions

1 of men and women in our world who struggle to
2 find dignity in life amidst devastating
3 dehumanizing poverty.

4 I spent a lot of years in South
5 America as a missionary, and I was one day
6 outside of the children's hospital in Lima,
7 Peru, with a child who was dying, was
8 dehydrated. Its life seeking out. Standing
9 outside of the children's hospital because
10 there was no way to get inside. There were
11 too many children ahead of us with their
12 mothers. And as that little girl's life ebbed
13 away standing there in the sunshine of a
14 summer day in Lima, I saw overhead supersonic
15 jet fighter planes flying, that the Peruvian
16 military had bought from France in this case.
17 Supersonic planes that an underdeveloped
18 country had no need of. And they had spent
19 \$12 million dollars, \$144 million dollars for
20 12 of these airplanes that were just toys for
21 the military. And I thought how many
22 children's hospitals, how many nurses and

1 doctors? How many children could have been
2 saved before they died at the age of one or
3 two years had Peru diverted its resources to
4 better means?

5 Those are the kinds of stakes that
6 we have in these expenditures on nuclear
7 weapons which are so, so useless in this world
8 today. That would be the end of my testimony.
9 But I would like to add just another note that
10 sort of calls into question, if you will,
11 hearings like this. Are they serious? It
12 seems as though the NNSA has heard testimonies
13 like this before, but have summarily dismissed
14 them. And I was reminded this week of this
15 phenomenon when I heard the vice president of
16 this country when he was asked what he thought
17 about the war, and the fact that the
18 preponderance of American's are against the
19 war. He said, "So." I hope that is not
20 what's happening here. A sort of Creeping
21 Cheneyism.

22 The NNSA should focus its

1 resources on developing alternative approaches
2 to maintaining the safety of the US nuclear
3 arsenal while managing the effective
4 dismantlement of these weapons. The Complex
5 Transformation that we seek, and I'm sure many
6 in this room, is a true transformation away
7 from a large provocative, and destabilizing
8 complex that threatens to ignite a new nuclear
9 arms race in this century and the following
10 century.

11 These horrendous weapons need to
12 be eliminated under safe and irreversible
13 conditions, under strict international
14 monitoring, and compliance with our
15 international commitments. I thank you again
16 for your attention and for the opportunity to
17 speak.

18 MR. BROWN: That brings us to the
19 end of the speakers who had signed up ahead of
20 time to speak. We have just a few minutes
21 left, but let me ask if there is anyone else
22 who would like to speak? Okay. In the front

1 row. And if folks can be brief so we can try
2 and get everybody in. If you can identify
3 yourself for the court reporter?

4 MS. THOMAS: Yes. My name is
5 Ellen Thomas and I'm taking the -- perhaps,
6 bold responsibility of speaking on behalf of
7 the people of the District of Columbia since
8 we're having this hearing in the District of
9 Colombia.

10 In 1993, the people of the
11 District of Columbia approved a voter
12 initiative called the "Nuclear Disarmaments
13 and Economic Conversion Act," which is asking
14 our government to promise the world that we
15 will get rid of all of our nuclear weapons if
16 everyone else does. And that we will use the
17 money saved each year, which I am learning
18 today is -- how much was that per year? How
19 many billions of dollars per year are we
20 spending on nuclear weapons? It will be used
21 instead to shut down and clean up the nuclear
22 weapons industries, and to convert other arms

1 industries into things that are good for
2 people.

3 For example, mass producing,
4 cleaning renewable energy systems that are
5 non-nuclear. And this has been a bill in the
6 US Congress. It's been introduced eight times
7 this session. It's HR1826. For those of you
8 who are here representing other state, I hope
9 you will take this home with you and help with
10 it. And I hope the Department of Energy will
11 also help with it because I believe that the
12 name of the Department of Energy is energy.
13 And nuclear weapons are not energy. They are
14 destruction. And the money that is going to
15 the Department of Energy should be used to
16 solve our energy problems.

17 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.
18 Okay, go ahead.

19 MR. YOUNG: My name is Stephen
20 Young, I work Union of Concerned Scientists.
21 I do want to thank Ted and the DOE, NNSA for
22 having these hearings across country. I want

1 to read you a brief quote from the Op-ED
2 written by George Schultz, Henry Kissinger,
3 Sam Nan and Bill Perry which they say,
4 "Reassertion of a vision of a world free of
5 nuclear weapons and practical measures towards
6 heeding that goal would be, and would be
7 perceived as a bold initiative consistent with
8 America's moral heritage." Think about that.
9 Can I do that?

10 It is a great country. Not a
11 perfect country. I would note that two of the
12 three remaining candidates for president have
13 endorsed this vision offered by those
14 gentlemen. I would encourage DOE, I would beg
15 DOE even, I would plead with DOE, you must
16 consider that vision. You must prepare for
17 that vision. You must plan to live in that
18 vision. It is a vision we all need. I do.
19 Thank you.

20 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Anyone
21 else? Susan did you have any -- okay. Well,
22 I think that my watch -- well, I'm sorry. Am

1 I missing somebody? Okay, it is 3:00 and we
2 are scheduled to adjourn. And thanks
3 everybody for attending for your comments.
4 And we are officially done. Thank you.

5 (Whereupon, the above-entitled
6 matter was concluded at 3:01 p.m.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

A				
abbreviate 51:9	85:12 95:11,14,19	adverse 122:21	93:5 104:7,9,22	130:18
able 48:18 59:21	100:6,8,19 101:2	adversely 9:7	105:1,7 106:13,15	America's 45:11
102:3	102:7 103:5	advised 28:22	Albany 60:5 61:1	134:8
abolish 117:21	108:10 120:22	Advisor 8:11	Albuquerque 1:17	amiss 129:2
abolition 10:1,5,16	actions 32:6 110:22	advocacy 42:6	103:20 105:17	amount 58:18
56:17 87:20 100:1	120:10	88:16	Alfred 2:4 70:21	amounts 8:17
100:21	active 15:1	advocate 3:17 93:14	75:16,19	amplifying 120:20
above-entitled	activism 112:19	advocates 27:15	alleviating 70:9	analysis 14:9,14
135:5	activist 72:6	affect 9:7	Alliance 1:23 2:4,6	15:14 29:10,20
absence 71:22	activities 80:3,14	affiliate 56:19 93:7	75:20 76:11 90:2	52:4 53:1,11 93:19
accelerate 27:9	83:15 108:17	affiliation 6:3	allies 22:20	analyzed 51:15
accelerating 34:13	111:16	affirm 89:17	allocate 32:8	and/or 68:10
acceptable 92:17	activity 111:22	affirms 70:11	allow 13:20 24:10	animal 67:10
acceptance 127:6	actual 98:2	afford 25:7	80:7	Anisa 2:18 81:12
127:12	actualize 85:13	affordable 45:21	allowed 7:8 22:15	84:16,19
access 45:21	add 5:10 13:16	AFSC 84:21	alternative 7:19,22	Ann 100:4
accidents 19:18	23:18 34:15 65:6	afternoon 3:5,19	9:21 10:6 14:19	anniversary 40:4
42:2	114:3 130:9	6:11 25:14 33:7	15:3,8 21:16 22:22	82:15
accompanying 79:1	addition 9:5 26:1	56:10 57:1 75:18	23:16 28:4 34:16	announcing 61:18
accomplishing	28:17 32:10 38:1	79:6 84:18 126:17	34:21 41:16 47:4	annual 107:2
118:1	106:15	afternoon's 3:5,15	51:19 54:6,8 55:14	annually 63:9
account 15:13 56:5	additional 38:3 53:6	age 2:13 42:5 46:16	57:4 67:2 73:21	anthology 49:14
59:2	77:20 96:12	116:9 130:2	76:1,7,13,14,17,20	anticipate 13:2
accountability 1:23	address 11:16 39:19	agencies 36:21	77:1,8,11 78:2,2,5	Anton 1:15 84:17
2:5,6 31:10 75:21	75:22 90:14	agency 11:3 36:18	78:7,20,21,22	88:1,2,3
76:11 90:3	addressed 112:3	54:7 72:17	79:12 81:9 83:11	anybody 4:7
accounts 49:17	addresses 112:7	aggressively 46:15	84:13 89:19 101:1	anymore 97:21
achieve 22:12 32:7	adequate 91:13	ago 40:11 71:8	101:5 102:12,18	118:22
39:18	adequately 112:3	95:13	103:1,6 115:13	anyone's 118:20
achieved 69:17	adherence 92:9	agree 35:4 36:13	126:5,6 131:1	apart 101:9
achievement 87:20	adjourn 135:2	54:7 84:8,10 85:17	alternatives 12:13	appear 65:3
achieving 46:12	administration 1:1	agreed 38:22 60:15	12:16 13:4,15	appeared 113:5
acknowledged	21:18 43:12 44:2,8	agreement 45:9	15:15 51:16 56:2	appears 51:12
60:12	63:3 75:12 85:12	83:5	76:5,10 77:13 91:5	appendices 29:11
acknowledges	103:12 122:4	agriculture 117:6	108:15,21 109:2	applaud 47:20
68:21	administration's	ahead 28:13 129:11	Alvarez 8:10	applauded 38:11
acquire 68:7	3:7 33:17,20 97:17	131:19 133:18	America 1:25 25:16	applause 120:15
acquisition 28:3	administrator 4:16	aide 49:21	129:5	application 18:16
acres 14:5	5:14 35:11	air 11:21 18:2,14	American 37:15	40:20
act 42:16 120:18	admired 64:8	74:3 113:19	49:7 52:19 68:2	applications 80:3
132:13	admonition 16:1	aircraft 11:21	82:21 84:20 107:1	applied 18:14 79:21
acting 120:9 125:7	adrift 35:14	airplane 98:9	115:19 119:12	appreciate 15:12
action 1:18,19,22	adults 110:15	airplanes 129:20	121:7	82:22 84:4 103:8
2:12,19 11:15 13:4	advance 69:8	Alamos 2:4,16 19:9	Americans 9:8	appreciated 12:10
30:22 31:14,17	Advanced 35:20	21:5 24:9,10 41:9	19:15 44:3 63:7	approach 93:17
56:12,13,15 62:6	adversaries 22:20	48:20 54:14 55:16	102:11,16,22	125:8
	23:5	55:19 63:5,6 71:22	103:7 116:12	approaches 131:1
	adversary 123:1	72:9 79:8,9 80:22	American's 45:21	appropriate 6:3

23:8 24:13	Association 107:1	Baghdad 19:3	Benjamin 16:7	bomb 19:17,18
approve 65:11	assumption 20:6	Baldwin 44:18 46:4	Bertell 17:17	27:19 38:17 39:4
approved 107:16	assumptions 29:13	ban 40:12 55:5	best 10:7 14:11 16:5	39:16,22 116:5
132:11	assure 22:19	banning 108:20	63:13 101:5	bombings 19:4
April 19:4	astrophysics 83:22	Baredei 86:18	better 32:7 35:13	82:15
ardent 31:20	Atlanta 95:10 96:9	Barfield 1:15 6:18	39:20 41:6,10 70:2	bombs 45:18 64:15
area 13:19 19:1,10	99:21	6:20,22 10:11	89:15 99:11,11	98:14,22 99:6
100:13 104:12,16	atomic 2:2 71:9,13	Bartell 19:16	106:10 111:11	117:9
104:19,21 105:13	82:15 116:9,20	baseball 15:20	119:13 130:4	bones 16:21
111:7 115:3	atone 102:13	based 15:10 21:11	beyond 1:25 112:15	book 116:3 117:9
areas 14:3 42:20	attachment 73:22	22:11 23:2 77:13	112:18	boom 11:9
43:3 80:1 100:9	74:1	78:5 88:11 90:7	Biblical 67:13	borders 73:8 97:8
argue 53:3	attack 68:1 82:8	91:12 97:16	big 17:21 41:10	born 17:7 19:21
argument 39:21	attacks 68:4	122:20 123:8	98:13 105:7	71:8
arguments 39:20	attempt 61:22	124:3	113:20	Bottom 106:1
67:19	attended 12:19	basic 20:6 80:3	biggest 63:13	bought 129:16
armed 26:11	44:21 47:2 96:7	basically 21:20	bill 1:25 21:2 25:12	Boulder 71:5
arms 25:15 26:14	attending 135:3	Basing 123:12	25:15 44:10 50:2	Branch 53:7
33:22 34:14 40:9	attention 131:16	basis 53:1 125:5,9	133:5 134:3	break 108:5
82:11 131:9	attitudes 80:12	battle 59:13	billion 16:17 29:17	Brewer 1:18 89:22
132:22	audience 47:17	beat 111:13	29:22 30:3,4 31:11	95:8,9,10 99:5
arroyos 105:9,14	audiovisual 42:3	becoming 20:10	31:12 58:9,12 62:8	brief 35:9 132:1
106:14	auditing 108:18	63:3 64:12 87:12	65:3,7 94:15 99:7	134:1
arsenal 15:17 43:2	augment 9:20	bee 98:19,21	99:10 127:22	briefly 21:7
43:18 52:1 58:11	August 59:16	bees 98:20,22	128:4	bring 9:1 89:5
65:21 67:6 68:14	107:17,18	bee-bee 98:13,14	billions 8:14 32:8	bringing 98:9
98:3,6,19 99:1,20	Augusta 96:8 98:4	bee-bees 98:8,9,16	45:14 84:8 123:7	113:21
101:21 131:3	99:16	98:18,21	125:17 128:22	brings 131:18
arsenals 27:11	Authorization	beg 134:14	132:19	broad 110:20 111:7
41:17 46:8 82:20	44:10	began 4:13	Bird 50:1	broadened 23:3
86:5	autoimmune 20:13	beginning 108:17	birth 97:5	31:19
Arthritis 20:18	20:17	begudge 58:5	Bishop 128:10	Bronson 115:6
article 78:15 86:12	available 55:11	behalf 16:14,18	bishops 40:4,6,11	brother 71:16
87:4 102:20	Avenue 1:10	30:21 31:4 38:3	40:14 82:2,13	brothers 66:19
114:14	avoided 64:22	41:18 47:2 66:16	bit 20:10 93:19	brought 71:7
asked 12:8 22:19	aware 118:12	132:6	103:19 122:15	Brown 1:11,14 3:3
37:6 113:9,10	Awe 19:4	beings 75:6 116:8	Black 63:19	3:14 5:16 6:21
130:16	a.m 3:2	119:5	Blanchard 1:17	10:10,17 16:11
asking 37:5 62:7		belief 40:1	100:4 103:17,18	21:1 25:12 30:15
132:13	B	believe 20:3 24:20	blatantly 54:1	33:4 37:19 41:20
asleep 113:6,11	babies 119:8	24:22 33:21 34:2	blissing 82:6	47:12 50:20 56:8
aspects 29:18	baby 17:6 104:8	45:6 61:14 68:9	blood 16:21 20:16	61:2 62:20 65:16
Assembly 86:6	back 38:15 57:14	69:6 79:11 85:17	blow 98:17	66:9 70:5,21 74:8
assertions 29:13	58:4 113:6	92:11 133:11	blunt 13:20	75:14,16 79:3
assessed 111:6	background 104:2	believes 31:15	board 10:21 114:12	81:11 84:16 87:22
associate 21:4	backward 41:10	beloved 105:17	114:13	89:21 93:20 95:7
associated 21:12	bad 57:5 62:17	benefit 96:1	boiled 13:14	99:3 100:3 103:15
67:21	104:5 106:5 119:7	benefits 79:13	bold 132:6 134:7	108:2 112:9

116:18 118:2 120:14 125:2 126:14 131:18 133:17 134:20 browse 3:11 brute 8:3 bucket 98:14,18,20 Buddhist 73:22 budget 65:7 124:11 budgets 37:12 buds 90:13 build 29:6 31:9 34:3 38:13 41:1 45:18 45:19 68:8 69:5 70:16 92:1 building 1:10 39:4 39:22 43:21 56:18 76:9 96:6 111:21 buildings 101:7,7 buildup 99:20 built 41:9 43:13 111:11 bulk 55:14 bulletin 114:12 bulleting 114:13 bullets 115:16,18 116:9 bully 75:9 bunker 35:19 burn 105:13 burned 105:8 Burson 93:6 Busby 19:2 Bush 43:12 44:2,7 52:8 business 14:13 15:14 114:13 bust 11:10 buster 35:19 buy 68:9	called 6:2 7:4 18:19 34:4 40:15 76:7 117:9 132:12 calling 7:19 19:13 88:12 89:18 calls 106:15 130:10 campaign 14:22 15:8,13 19:2 campaigns 125:14 cancer 16:20 20:14 67:12 candidates 26:18 134:12 capabilities 22:11 24:3 33:19 37:14 68:22 79:21 capability 22:19 24:8,9 35:4 78:4 capacity 38:18,21 39:5 41:1 capital 96:15 capture 49:17 captured 49:11 care 95:2 career 79:11 112:18 carelessly 104:14 Carmen 73:15 Carnegie 32:12 carried 80:22 case 14:14 15:14 129:16 cases 74:20 catastrophically 111:5 categories 109:12 CATHERINE 1:22 Catholic 33:12 38:7 40:4 66:18 126:19 126:22 128:10,11 Cathy 1:22 10:18 cause 89:11 causes 97:5 causing 67:12 ceased 61:4 cell 51:1 center 13:7 35:18 38:13 72:14 central 13:19	cents 57:14 century 29:5 48:7 128:18 131:9,10 Cernansky 1:19 25:13 30:16,18,21 certain 74:2 certainly 14:1 28:8 29:5 30:10 certify 77:5 chair 26:12 chairman 10:21 challenges 36:12,13 79:18 80:5 124:21 125:21 chance 42:17 change 40:21 41:5,9 74:2,17 75:11 126:2,13 changed 31:18 71:11,12 95:18 changes 96:17 122:22 changing 40:20 Chapter 95:11 chapters 56:21 128:12 Charlie 62:21 66:9 chemical 18:13 chemistry 41:7 Cheneyism 130:21 Chernansky 95:12 CHERYL 2:19 child 16:16 73:10 129:7 children 16:15,15 16:18,20 17:8 19:10,21 73:11,12 96:20 99:12 110:10 118:15 119:8 120:4,5 129:11 130:1 children's 129:6,9 129:22 Chilicott 127:14 China 55:7 81:4 choice 86:3 choosing 108:6 Chris 19:1	Christi 2:8 Christian 88:4 Christina 1:19 25:13 30:16,20 Christopher 2:10 47:13 50:21 51:4 chronicles 116:4 church 40:2 81:20 106:7 127:1,1,18 church's 82:6 Cincinnati 118:9,10 Cindy 2:2 41:20 47:12,13,14 cite 13:21 cited 101:19 citizen 21:10 citizens 8:22 18:5 43:7 70:7 119:20 128:14 city 54:6 70:13 91:18,19 92:3 97:12 100:11,12 civil 26:7 55:22 125:12 civilian 55:19 107:10 civilization 110:17 117:5 class 46:2 114:10 classified 12:3 classmates 83:21 84:1 clean 8:20 25:5 60:16 63:22 72:20 74:18 77:3,14 94:16 132:21 cleaned 72:15 73:3 94:9,19 106:13 cleaner 111:12 cleaning 95:1 133:4 cleanup 99:13 clear 67:20 69:4 82:3 126:22 127:2 127:18 clearly 127:10 client 107:8 climate 103:4 126:1 clinging 71:1	clings 71:2 clinic 70:16 close 16:1 92:12 117:8 closed 94:8 closing 101:7 closure 54:10 CMR 102:5 CNPC 13:21 coalition 81:17 coexistence 75:3 coin 112:21 cold 21:19 23:12 50:16 85:9 94:5 95:14 collaboratively 90:5 collapse 53:12 colleagues 6:21 23:21 81:7 114:5 collective 14:16 Colombia 132:7,9 132:11 Colorado 71:5,21 73:7 colossal 60:19 combatants 89:10 combination 14:2 21:11 combined 77:18 come 10:9 28:12 62:5 66:15 72:11 74:3 80:7 85:10 86:17 90:15 92:12 93:10 96:14,17 118:16 122:1 comes 36:17 57:14 60:3 coming 47:16 91:2 commend 7:17 comment 5:1,3,9,22 6:16 36:4 51:11 57:17 81:14 83:5 90:18,22 92:16 121:3,9,13,16 comments 4:12 5:6 5:7,17 11:11 23:11 35:10 36:5,8 44:20 51:13,14 75:21
C				
calculations 92:10 California 100:11 103:21 call 6:7,17 28:19 55:13 76:13 90:16 112:5				

83:9 92:7,11 99:19 100:17 121:6 125:6 126:9 135:3 commercial 112:20 commission 53:8 59:21 71:9,13 Commissioner's 10:22 commit 32:19 39:15 110:8 122:14 commitment 21:13 22:12 23:19 69:7 108:11 111:2,20 123:21 commitments 46:20 131:15 committed 55:4 81:17 committee 1:20 26:12 33:8 56:14 58:8 83:6 115:20 Committee's 84:20 common 70:11 commonsense 122:12 123:10,14 124:6 commonsensical 121:19 communities 37:6 48:13 57:20 58:6 70:18 95:1,4,5 128:11 community 74:6 90:7 97:8 company 59:20 compare 127:19 compared 36:20 comparison 17:1 competencies 84:5 competency 24:22 competitive 54:21 complete 82:7 completed 3:13 6:6 63:22 completely 50:18 91:21 complex 1:4 3:10 4:5,21 7:4,6,20 8:6	8:22 9:6,16 10:6 11:11 12:10,12 14:14 21:14 22:9 22:12,18 23:12 25:6,20 29:18,22 30:7 31:6,8 33:19 34:12 35:6 38:10 38:19 40:20,21 42:13,19 43:1 44:1 44:12 45:7,16 51:17 53:13,16,18 54:1 55:15 57:4,18 61:16 62:8 65:11 67:1,3,21 68:16 69:1,9 74:17 76:19 76:21 77:5 78:19 79:16 83:2,11,17 85:13 87:1,17 89:19 90:8 93:8,10 94:3,13,17,21 96:13 97:15,22 100:10 101:4 102:2 108:8,13,19 109:11 111:10,12 111:14,22 118:14 121:19 122:1,20 123:3 124:7,10 128:1,2 131:4,8 complexes 20:9 complexity 90:19 compliance 32:12 39:6 54:9 131:14 complicated 69:15 component 54:16 69:3 components 108:6 comprehensive 55:5 comprising 14:4 compromise 15:16 conceivable 52:22 conceived 91:7 concentrations 60:20 concept 93:16 concepts 35:20 concern 1:17 17:8 27:17 73:4	concerned 2:20 63:4 93:5 96:18 133:20 concerns 2:9 44:12 66:17 concert 52:1 concerted 23:15 concluded 4:14 135:6 concludes 8:13 14:10 conclusion 14:13 15:14 conditioned 127:6 conditions 77:20 131:13 conducted 80:15 conference 2:2 38:4 40:11 41:12 47:3 107:4 confidence 22:15 82:7 confine 6:11 conflict 32:19 40:8 56:17 conflicts 82:21 confront 80:6 congregational 88:19 congregations 38:6 88:17 Congress 7:7 21:18 35:16,17,19,20,21 35:22 38:11 39:13 44:8 52:10,11 53:5 86:6 101:17 103:11 122:3,10 125:7 126:11 133:6 conjunction 42:10 connection 70:12 connotation 41:4 consciousness 24:5 consequences 77:11 77:22 consider 12:14 15:15 27:6 35:1 87:12 111:9,15	134:16 consideration 32:20 76:3 87:21 considered 12:1 26:20 27:3,13 96:12 considering 14:16 15:4 consist 53:17 consisted 53:13 consistent 15:5 34:19 79:17 89:4 134:7 consolidate 35:5 39:1 79:16 consolidated 35:18 38:13 73:13 consolidating 51:17 54:12,15 55:14,17 83:16 101:10 consolidation 56:2 constituents 15:11 15:18 Constitution 7:16 constructed 55:20 construction 14:6 consultants 30:5 CONT 2:1 containment 62:12 contains 4:3 contaminants 59:17 contaminated 95:3 contaminating 18:2 contemplating 65:22 content 18:1 contents 4:22 context 16:2 continually 44:6 continue 5:12 31:19 35:6 67:9 77:5 118:18 continued 21:19 43:13 79:19 81:2 continues 4:14 119:19 continuing 63:9 83:17 103:11	111:22 119:2 continuously 18:1 contracted 13:6 93:6 contracts 57:9 contrary 23:17 contribute 104:3 control 26:14 34:14 controls 11:4 conveniently 94:10 118:10 convention 108:20 conventions 107:7,9 107:11,16 Conversion 132:13 convert 132:22 convince 69:5 convinced 10:4 82:9 cooperate 66:1 cooperation 61:20 cooperatively 50:11 coordinator 88:3 copy 13:12 47:8,10 Corbin 113:4,11,16 core 84:5 cornerstone 87:6 cost 14:17 29:10,22 59:7 60:18 82:9 costly 40:22 costs 14:16 99:6 Council 2:11 51:6 82:1,13 count 104:6 countless 45:14 countries 27:9 46:18 64:11 69:5 country 22:15 25:1 32:22 40:14 47:22 64:12 65:15 90:20 94:6 99:17 100:8 121:11,11 124:16 124:19 126:19 128:11 129:18 130:16 133:22 134:10,11 country's 39:5 64:9 county 1:21 10:21 10:22 11:3,10,19
---	--	---	--	---

12:15 13:6,10,11 13:16,18,19,22 59:10 79:9 county's 11:14 13:13 couple 29:14 45:2 56:22 92:10 courage 40:7,16 course 9:14 12:22 22:1 70:11 116:7 courses 65:6 court 5:5,20 6:5 7:12 132:3 crass 49:12 create 58:21 62:11 100:19 119:2 created 17:15 49:9 64:18 110:21 119:15 creates 58:17 62:1 creating 41:15 creation 67:14 70:13 81:22 creativity 125:20 credible 29:2 109:9 credulity 123:9 Creeping 130:20 crew 11:21 crisis 81:22 103:4 critical 121:10,10 cross 97:4 crossroads 35:12 CTBT 54:10 CTVT 51:21 Culp 1:20 30:16 33:5,7,8 38:2 83:9 88:7 culture 56:18 curatorship 77:8 currency 32:18 current 7:3,20 36:14 45:12 52:3 62:11,13 67:6 91:15 98:2,5 101:21 103:4 currently 31:1 96:22 custodial 15:2	cute 94:1 cycles 11:10 <hr/> D <hr/> dad 71:9 damage 19:20,22 89:11 105:2 danger 9:14 22:7 59:11 88:5 101:11 dangerous 33:21 40:22 66:4 67:8 85:14 97:4 dangerously 9:2 dangers 85:16 date 100:18 112:5 daughter 73:14 104:7 118:7,8 119:21 daunted 98:8 David 1:20 30:16 33:5,6,8 38:2 83:9 88:7 day 65:5 90:17 106:12 129:5,14 days 19:5,12 71:13 92:10 117:14 deal 29:17 55:21 66:7 73:13 113:1 123:4,21 124:7 125:20 dealing 119:14 123:17 death 67:13 debate 122:2,12 debated 49:2 125:10 decades 28:12 64:19 67:12 68:12 80:6 decedents 10:8 18:3 December 38:9 52:10 decide 28:11 decision 47:19 48:2 79:14 81:10 91:2 91:20 declare 68:17 declared 40:6 86:11 86:14	decrease 74:16 decreasing 77:9 dedicated 56:15 dedication 82:22 deep 23:22 121:20 deeply 88:20 89:2 121:20 defeated 117:17 defects 97:5 defend 81:3 defense 2:10 4:16 5:14 11:20 18:6 20:19 26:10 36:21 44:9 51:6 52:7,9 81:21 defenses 82:8,10 defined 80:18 defines 76:21 definition 23:6 deformities 67:12 defy 7:11,13 degradation 74:15 77:21 105:3 dehumanizing 129:3 dehydrated 129:8 deja 38:8 deliberate 34:8 delighted 50:8 deliver 4:7 delivered 16:6 delivery 9:12 99:8 delusion 69:10 demands 84:12 democracy 8:2 demonstrates 69:1 demonstration 98:4 98:6,11 denuclearizing 41:17 Denver 71:8 department 1:1 3:17 5:15 6:15 7:5 17:20,21 20:4 25:18 31:7 34:11 35:1 36:9,21 37:1 37:18 41:13 42:18 44:5 45:7 47:10,17	48:3 55:12 56:4 57:13 71:1 72:16 74:7 78:14 83:1 85:11 94:12 124:15 133:10,12 133:15 Department's 34:5 49:11 depends 27:4 depleted 18:18,22 60:4 62:13 deputy 4:16 5:14 35:11 127:14 described 115:7,13 description 78:22 deserve 16:9 deserves 93:18 design 35:3 54:2,19 54:22 55:1 designated 12:3 designed 46:6 123:4 designing 76:8 designs 83:13 desire 58:7 despite 9:9 60:19 69:13 destabilization 7:11 destabilizing 131:7 destroy 67:4,16 113:13 destroyed 50:18 65:2 83:15 110:16 destroying 65:1 destruction 40:9 46:7 68:2 133:14 destructive 69:11 detail 76:15 detailed 15:12 76:6 78:21 123:5 deter 22:20 68:4,5 determine 59:22 determined 24:14 69:11 deterrence 127:7 deterrent 80:1 81:3 128:6 Deterrents 82:5 detonation 67:10	devalue 32:17 devastating 129:2 develop 60:1 70:14 118:18 123:19 developed 88:12 119:3 developing 68:15 74:14 82:9,17 131:1 development 9:11 13:7 62:16 70:3 82:19 deviation 14:18 devoted 113:16 diabetes 20:18 dialogue 88:11 89:5 died 104:13 116:12 130:2 difference 127:20 different 12:13 23:4 36:19 77:12 78:5 126:3 difficult 12:15 75:10 dignitaries 26:13 dignity 119:13 129:2 dinner 71:15 diplomacy 75:4 diplomatic 70:2 107:3,4 direct 51:5 directing 52:13 direction 52:19 72:11 95:21 117:22 126:10 Directions 1:18,19 30:22 31:15 95:11 95:20 directly 34:10 100:9 109:14 director 21:4 25:15 31:5 33:1 42:5 56:12,20 63:17 75:20 86:17 90:2 120:22 disagree 101:4 disappear 94:7,11
---	---	--	--	--

disarm 95:17 102:20	52:22 53:4 66:14 81:21 91:8,12,14 91:21 92:4	Dr 19:1,16 85:21	education 46:1 58:17 107:1	118:3,8
disarmament 22:18 31:18,20 34:9 37:10 46:13 68:20 95:14 127:8	documents 44:6 49:20 90:19 91:1 122:6	draft 5:19 12:12 51:11 52:3 76:2,4 83:2	educational 62:14 104:1	emphasis 12:20
Disarmaments 132:12	dodged 115:18 116:9	dramatic 24:21	effect 111:18	Empire 116:4
disaster 8:9 60:14	dodging 115:16	drastic 91:6	effected 42:21 96:17	employee 3:16 79:7
disclosure 47:15	DOE 5:19 8:19 29:8 38:10 42:1 52:14 68:9,21 70:22 99:18 102:10,16 102:21 112:12 113:1 121:1 124:11 125:20 133:21 134:14,15 134:15	dropped 98:13,15 98:16,18	effecting 20:12	employees 83:1
discovered 19:3	DOE's 30:5 119:18 123:13 124:20	drought 106:17	effective 106:16 119:10 131:3	employer 17:12
discredited 52:5	doing 12:6 18:21 48:11 65:10 87:18 88:16 97:2 104:19 106:21 120:10	DU 60:20 61:4,6	effects 77:18 115:7	enable 25:4 38:20
discredited 52:5	dollar 33:18 57:12 58:4	due 86:10	efficiencies 30:6	enabled 25:4
discriminate 89:9	dollars 8:15 15:20 25:22 29:17,22 30:3,4 32:8 38:12 39:15 45:15 58:3,9 58:12 60:18 62:8 65:3,5,8 84:9 92:1 94:15 97:22 99:7 102:4 123:8 125:18 128:4 129:19,19 132:19	dump 114:1	efficiency 58:20 84:14	enact 102:17
discuss 4:20	domestic 109:14	dumped 73:1	efficient 20:11 106:16	encourage 32:10 34:1 37:1 81:8 93:9 134:14
discussed 102:2	dominance 9:18	dumps 17:19	effort 23:15 60:19 122:3 123:13 125:11	endanger 7:9 8:21 119:19
discussion 26:7 91:14	Donald 52:7,9	dust 60:21	efforts 27:10 34:13 47:20 68:16 69:8 118:7	ended 63:12 64:15 95:15 124:8
disease 20:13,17	door 13:10 90:8	duty 12:7	eight 4:15 20:9 53:13,17 133:6	endorsed 134:13
dismantle 32:9 62:10 64:21 74:18	dose 20:7,8	DVD 47:6	EIS 27:1 29:11	Endowment 32:13
dismantled 77:4	double 86:19	dying 129:7	either 51:1 55:18 62:3 86:3	endured 32:4
dismantlement 34:14 76:8 77:1,14 94:22 103:14 108:18 131:4	downsize 35:5	dysfunction 64:14 64:22	El 86:18 105:17	enemies 62:1
dismissed 130:13	downsizing 83:16	dysfunctional 64:12	elaborates 10:14	enemy 18:19
disorder 20:16	downstream 116:14	Dyson 50:9	elaborations 89:16	energetically 32:6
displaced 63:7	downtown 60:22 115:6	D.C 1:10 19:1,10 42:5 57:16	elected 13:1 38:5	energy 1:1 3:17 5:15 6:15 7:5 8:8 8:12 17:20 23:8 25:9 34:4,10 35:1 36:9 37:1 41:13,16 44:5 45:7 47:11,18 57:13 58:20 71:2,9 71:13 72:16 74:7 78:14 83:1 84:13 85:11 102:8 103:2 105:6 124:15 133:4,10,12,12,13 133:15,16
displays 3:11	downwind 116:13	Dr 19:1,16 85:21	election 80:19,20	Energy's 25:18 31:7 42:18 94:12
disposal 9:2 102:15		Dr 19:1,16 85:21	elements 22:4	enforced 60:11
disposition 8:18 77:2 94:22		Dr 19:1,16 85:21	eliminate 46:6 68:11 78:18 125:11	engage 121:15
disputes 75:5		Dr 19:1,16 85:21	eliminated 76:3,5 91:21 131:12	engaged 121:4
disruptions 117:6		Dr 19:1,16 85:21	eliminating 27:16 31:16 108:20	engine 115:1
distances 115:7		Dr 19:1,16 85:21	elimination 28:1 42:7 47:5 52:1 81:17 86:4 88:13	enhanced 65:12
distinct 127:20		Dr 19:1,16 85:21	Ellen 1:15 2:15 6:18 6:22 132:5	enhancing 58:10 68:13
distinguished 28:21		Dr 19:1,16 85:21	eloquent 114:4	enjoy 36:1
distraction 66:4		Dr 19:1,16 85:21	embarked 127:22	enormous 65:21 82:9 89:13
District 11:1 132:7 132:8,11		Dr 19:1,16 85:21	embody 127:12	ensure 3:19,22
diverted 130:3		Dr 19:1,16 85:21	Emily 2:21 112:10	
dividend 95:22		Dr 19:1,16 85:21		
doctor 17:17 84:2		Dr 19:1,16 85:21		
doctoral 83:21		Dr 19:1,16 85:21		
doctors 130:1		Dr 19:1,16 85:21		
doctrines 127:12		Dr 19:1,16 85:21		
document 4:20 5:19 10:14 27:3 44:9		Dr 19:1,16 85:21		

E

23:20 31:22 45:20 50:4 79:18 128:5 entail 15:8 enter 70:13 enterprise 21:13,21 24:6,18 entire 24:6 34:6 66:3,5 79:11 98:19 110:12 113:16 entirely 119:8 environment 7:10 8:5 9:7,15 25:9 45:22 62:18 69:14 74:16 76:20 85:19 89:12 111:9 120:11,12 122:14 123:1 124:9,14 environmental 1:2 3:8 8:9 12:21 23:9 23:18 24:5 25:5 26:1 42:16 59:7,11 60:9,14 61:8,10 62:12 63:4,10,13 63:16 77:3,11,17 77:19,21 78:6 91:11,16 96:1 102:13 109:4,8,9 109:10 110:1 111:17 112:4,6,7 114:6 environmentally 23:14 24:17 41:15 envisioned 61:15 EPA 17:18 Episcopal 2:5 63:1 episode 115:15 equally 59:6 equitable 3:22 Esmeralda 13:11 especially 13:18 53:4 84:10 112:21 127:1 essential 87:18 establishment 54:22 101:15 esteemed 15:6 estimated 13:9 19:16	estimates 31:10 euphoria 117:13,15 evacuated 105:10 evaluation 91:5 event 48:7 events 122:21 eventual 51:22 eventually 100:1 everybody 3:20 98:5 124:17 132:2 135:3 evidence 78:10 evident 87:7 evil 73:22 74:1 examine 54:10 examined 56:3 examining 97:22 example 11:8 27:6 28:19 73:7 133:3 exceeds 36:8 excellence 23:3,7 79:19 excerpts 44:15 45:3 excess 29:3 exchange 114:20 117:1 exchanged 117:2 executive 31:5 33:1 52:13 53:7 56:11 120:21 exercise 4:10 21:19 exist 27:19 existence 88:22 96:19 110:2 existing 27:1 29:21 41:17 55:10 65:6 78:9 108:18 exists 27:20 exorcism 63:8 expand 35:3 Expanding 104:21 expands 124:6 expanse 23:3 expect 46:21 expecting 10:12 expenditures 57:10 57:13 130:6 expensive 33:22	experience 21:12 60:3 70:10 104:10 experiences 59:6 86:1 expertise 25:7 26:15 41:14 experts 15:7 28:21 43:4 123:18 explain 3:21 76:13 explanation 15:12 explicitly 52:4 116:1 explode 18:12 19:8 115:5 exploded 114:9 exploding 18:22 explosion 67:11 explosives 19:14 exposed 20:1 express 118:13 expunged 53:4 extend 92:15 extended 121:9 extending 34:14 121:13 extension 90:17,17 extensively 18:8 extent 29:11 60:1 69:18,20 extermination 107:10 extraction 97:1	97:1 101:16 102:6 facing 32:21 103:3 110:11 123:17 fact 26:17 50:6 53:3 53:5 72:6 82:11 91:10 101:19 105:20 110:1 130:17 factories 27:8 factors 80:7 factory 114:22 faculty 103:21 fail 126:8 failing 8:19 fails 94:4 fair 3:22 fairness 12:9 faith 41:3 54:9 67:18 81:16 83:6 86:7 Faithful 2:7 fall 49:16 109:12 fallen 101:13 falling 98:20 101:9 fallout 116:13 families 58:7 110:17 124:18 family 34:6 64:7 73:18 74:5 79:9 118:15 famine 117:7 far 19:17 43:2 farmers 106:9 far-reaching 56:2 fatal 121:21 Fatalities 19:19 Father 126:17 favor 100:22 favorable 14:19 fear 86:15 96:20 117:15 February 42:9,10 federal 11:3 43:5 45:17 58:11,14 60:9,12 61:9 federally 11:9 feel 62:17 69:19,20 88:20 89:1	feeling 43:10 feelings 80:21 Feingold 44:17 46:14 fellow 24:1 102:1 Fellowship 2:5 63:2 felt 95:15 Fernald 118:11 festival 63:11 fewer 27:18 39:2 field 84:3,6 103:22 112:19 fifth 90:11 fighter 12:2 129:15 film 63:11 films 63:14 final 13:3 100:18 finally 29:9 80:4 83:19 find 36:18 88:18 89:1 102:3 129:2 findings 80:20 fire 105:7,11 firm 93:9,13 firmly 33:16 first 6:7,17 13:15 25:17 26:6 29:15 49:17 62:3 63:14 79:15 82:2 84:3 87:8 90:16 96:7 98:3 107:18 109:21 116:10 121:22 122:13,14 fiscal 94:14 fissile 77:2 Fitch 50:9 five 6:11 10:12 32:11,14,19 52:20 58:3 fixed 53:2 Flats 72:12,22 102:9,10 flavors 108:9 flaw 126:12 flaws 121:21,21 flexible 74:3 flight 11:17 14:11 14:14 16:5
F				
F 17:11 fabrication 55:18 face 124:2,21 125:21 126:2 faced 13:5 faces 86:3 facilitator 1:11,14 3:15 facilities 11:6 14:15 28:15 48:18 54:4 60:7 61:12 78:11 90:10 91:9 94:5 facility 29:6 35:17 41:8 55:20 92:2				

guys 119:7	112:13 113:3,8 132:8	home 11:5,20 12:1 31:22 64:14 133:9	hysterical 105:5	50:15,19 90:21 93:1 98:1 109:22 115:11 126:21
<hr/> H <hr/>			<hr/> I <hr/>	
hand 4:6 48:6,20 49:17	hearings 11:14 47:21 57:18,20 81:7 93:4,11 99:17	homelands 113:18	IAEA 86:17	importantly 126:4
handout 36:11	113:1 130:11	honor 45:5	ICBMs 9:12	impossible 64:1
hands 4:9 27:18,21 101:13	133:22	hope 3:10 10:7 42:1 70:16 120:1,7 128:15 130:19 133:8,10	iconic 48:18	impression 115:9
Hanford 48:19 63:20	heart 73:18 105:16 122:20	hopefully 30:9 100:13,17	idea 40:13 66:3 73:22 75:22 98:5,8 101:6,9 104:5	imprint 48:8
happen 107:3 114:19 117:17	heavens 74:10 75:5	hoping 99:21,22	ideas 71:2	improve 118:20
happened 114:14 117:11	hedge 55:2	Horizontal 123:18	identify 22:3 59:22 132:2	improved 62:9
happening 72:20 124:12 130:20	heeding 134:6	horrendous 131:11	ignite 131:8	improvement 77:19
happily 94:18	height 94:4	hospital 129:6,9	ignored 51:12	improvements 59:4 62:15
happy 41:18 47:9 63:2	held 57:18,20	hospitals 129:22	ignores 39:11	improving 38:12
Harbor 64:6	help 64:10 69:20 80:1 133:9,11	host 12:2 96:22 109:2	II 11:1,21 23:13 26:22 117:18	inadequacies 109:5
hard 17:15 49:14 50:11 111:13 118:6	helped 64:13 72:12	hosting 112:12	illegal 32:17	inadequate 109:6
harm 20:22 63:9 67:9 74:4	helping 121:2	hour 4:13	illegality 7:12	include 13:4 20:17 81:8 83:12 116:2
Harney 113:5	Henry 26:10 134:2	hours 113:8	illegally 73:1	included 79:14 90:22 92:4
Hartung 1:25 21:2 25:12,14,15	heritage 2:2 134:8	house 3:13 4:13 72:1	imagination 37:15	includes 9:3 33:11 103:13 105:21
hatred 110:7	Hi 30:18 47:14 100:5	household 60:21	imagine 65:9	including 34:12 51:18 57:13 58:15 85:5 100:10 125:21
hazard 17:3	high 14:20 19:13 52:13 60:19 116:19 117:19	houses 101:16	imagined 124:2	incompatible 128:17
hazards 17:2,20 101:8	higher 58:18,22	HR1826 133:7	imbalance 86:2 87:11	incomplete 26:4
head 46:2 71:10	highest 58:2	HTM 14:20	immediate 34:8	increase 38:20 41:1 74:15 85:15
health 17:2,3,20 18:5 20:4,8 23:21 77:19 102:13	highly 8:17	Hudson 59:18	immediately 5:1 105:11 117:14	increased 84:13 119:20
healthcare 45:22 58:20 99:12 119:17	hire 93:13	huge 48:21 75:2	immoral 89:8	increasing 34:12 39:4 111:3 119:1
hear 5:7 121:17 123:10	hiring 93:9	human 8:1,2 10:3 17:5 34:6 56:18 70:1 75:6 115:15 119:5,12	impact 1:3 3:8 11:7 26:1 27:12 57:2 58:15,22 59:2 61:10 85:18 91:11 91:16 109:5,8,10 109:11 110:1,20 110:22 112:4,6	increasingly 39:15
heard 35:11 42:20 71:3 130:12,15	Hiroshima 63:17 82:16 98:15,22 107:13 116:2,10 117:11	humanity 70:12 86:3 89:7 116:6	impacted 90:9	Incredibly 51:11
hearing 1:5,9,14 3:6 4:11 6:15 38:8 42:12,14 44:15,16 47:6 90:11 96:7,14 98:3 100:13 104:3	historian 51:8	humans 96:1	impacts 12:21 13:2 13:9 14:16 78:6 109:17 112:7 120:2	indefinitely 119:15
	historians 50:1	hundred 45:13 47:21	imperial 75:9	indelible 48:8
	historic 49:19	hundreds 19:6,6 56:20 66:17 116:11 123:7 125:17	implementation 8:7 51:20	Independence 1:10
	histories 50:5	hunger 121:7	implications 84:15	independent 14:9 14:13 15:6 53:7 80:11
	history 48:5 49:7,8 50:16 63:20 71:6 115:15,22	hurting 120:12	important 12:22 32:21 42:16 45:5 46:17 48:2,15	indicating 126:9
	hold 23:21 63:8 74:2 97:21	husband 71:20		indifferent 17:10
	holding 14:9 99:17	hustle 50:7		indispensable 69:2
	holdings 81:7	hypocrisy 86:19		
	holdouts 55:6	hypothesizing 115:4		
	Holmes 1:11,14 3:14 90:12			

individuals 7:18	131:13,15	15:9,11 58:16,18	kibash 101:17	labs 18:9 21:14
induced 11:9	internationally	58:21 71:12	kick 30:7	22:18 71:11
industrial 54:1	110:6	John 17:11 79:7	kids 73:9	lack 60:10 82:7
industries 60:5,8,13	interviewing 50:8	127:5,5	kill 19:14 119:6	91:17
132:22 133:1	intimidate 119:4	joint 33:10 88:6	killed 19:17 95:3	laid 79:12 109:3
inevitably 48:10	intimidation 61:19	89:17	110:14	lake 72:7
86:9	intrigued 72:5	Jon 2:12 118:3	killling 20:20	laminated 76:10
inextricably 70:1	intrinsic 29:3	120:15,21	kind 17:22 20:16	Lana 73:17
information 4:4,11	introduce 6:2	Jonathan 2:16	52:13 70:18 93:17	land 7:17 14:3 63:8
4:12 5:13	introduced 133:6	75:17 79:4,5	114:9 117:17	105:3
infra 59:3	introduction 6:17	Joni 1:21 6:18	122:18	landmark 64:20
infrastructure 44:1	inventoried 24:10	10:18,20	kinds 130:5	lands 9:8 11:3 63:15
62:15 122:19	invest 102:4 119:9	Joseph 2:8 85:21	Kissinger 26:10	64:1
initial 67:10 117:12	investigating 102:8	116:4 126:15,17	134:2	language 107:14,17
117:15	investing 30:13	judgement 15:6	kits 28:20	LANL 93:13
initiate 87:5	118:22	Judith 2:6 66:10	knew 72:3	Lanuwet 50:2
initiative 1:15 2:18	investment 57:5,11	71:4	know 6:12 10:2	large 131:7
25:16 35:20 88:4	62:18	Judy's 72:10	12:14,17 18:17	larger 39:12
88:10 132:12	investments 28:14	June 17:12 112:16	20:12 39:13 48:12	largest 14:3
134:7	29:16 30:2	justice 72:14 82:12	49:13 50:3,13,17	Las 11:13 12:19
initiatives 30:14	involve 34:10	85:1 114:6	54:19 67:5 72:3	Lastly 24:19
70:3	involved 72:4 94:6		73:20 90:13 92:22	late 62:3 85:4
inject 128:19	ionizing 20:1	K	93:4,11,14,15,18	latest 97:14
innocents 89:10	Iran 81:4 86:16	Kai 50:1	94:10 97:15 101:9	launching 85:5
Innovations 123:1	irreparable 89:11	Kalamazoo 114:16	105:4 106:18	Laureate 85:20
insecurity 7:11	irresponsible	114:19 115:6	107:2 109:18	law 7:17 8:3
inside 129:10	118:17	Kamps 1:25 108:3	110:12,14 115:4	lay 66:19
insist 72:14 73:3	irreversible 131:12	112:11,15 116:19	117:5 120:5	laying 52:18
install 97:12	issue 17:4 26:16	Kansas 54:6 91:18	123:16	lead 7:10 8:9 60:4,8
instance 84:8	32:21 82:12,12	91:19 92:3 100:11	known 17:14	75:2
instances 115:21	88:21 91:1 93:3	100:12	knows 123:22	leader 113:4
institute 14:22	112:22 127:18	Katherine 95:8	Korea 81:5 86:14	leaders 33:16 34:7
intellect 84:11	issues 25:5 48:6	100:4,5	Krista 1:18 89:22	38:5 80:16,17
intend 68:18	90:6 92:21 96:10	Kathy 16:11,13	95:7,9	leadership 2:2
intended 61:8	115:10	keep 4:9 72:19 84:9	Kristina 95:12	21:17 24:15,22
intent 9:15 38:20	I'd 128:19	92:13 105:21		38:4 41:11 102:19
40:22 119:3 122:7	J	106:2 118:6	L	104:1 117:20
interest 90:19	January 32:3 59:19	keeping 27:17	lab 81:3 93:5 105:6	League 1:15 7:1
interested 115:10	Japan 64:6	Kelly 2:2 41:21	105:8	9:19
interesting 29:15	Japanese 63:17	47:13,14,14	labeled 17:19	leaking 59:17
93:17	JASON 28:20	Kennedy 17:12	laboratories 21:10	leaks 59:22
interfaith 81:16	101:20	kept 30:1 106:3	34:17 54:3,19	learn 106:5 108:1
interfere 51:2	jeopardized 44:3	Kessler 44:19 45:4	57:21 58:6 79:20	learned 107:19
interim 127:7	jet 129:15	Kevin 1:25 108:3	80:4	112:14
intermediate 85:7	Jewish 33:12	112:10,10,15	laboratory 2:4,17	learning 132:17
international 1:15	job 64:4 71:12	key 22:4 34:14	18:10 21:6 24:11	leave 13:11 71:21
7:1 9:19 32:13	jobs 13:16,17,19	91:19	54:15,17 55:1 79:8	leaving 55:19
37:6 82:21 109:15		Keysville 97:9	81:1 108:5	left 48:3,7 61:2

65:17 74:9 93:21 99:4 116:18 125:3 131:21 legacy 72:21 legal 59:13 78:16 Legislation 1:21 33:9 83:6 legislators 31:1,3 letter 40:5 81:21 letting 99:15 Let's 75:11 leukemia 16:21 20:16 level 19:2 24:7 88:19 leveled 25:8 levels 22:17 30:11 license 19:14 59:14 lie 66:5 lies 11:1 39:22 life 10:3 17:5 49:3 72:10 75:1 89:1 113:16,17 119:12 129:2,8,12 lifetime 29:3 78:8 lifetimes 29:2 light 37:4 63:19 117:10 likelihood 111:3 Lima 129:6,14 limited 52:17 117:1 limiting 83:13 line 74:21 106:1 lines 40:18 linked 70:1 list 5:11 34:15 35:14 76:10 87:7 116:10 listed 45:3 listen 99:18 119:17 120:2 listened 115:17 listening 88:17 lists 76:4 literally 45:8 litigation 56:6 little 4:10 16:8,9 20:10,11 50:12 71:6 72:10 94:1	98:8 103:19 122:15 129:12 live 16:19 18:4 68:18 73:16 95:5 100:9 103:19 110:4,5,15,19 134:17 lived 55:11 64:6 71:22 72:9 Livermore 18:9 19:9 lives 8:22 9:8 24:2 34:5 63:6,15 64:2 74:20 97:10 119:19 living 18:3 66:19 96:16 Lobby 31:1 local 24:7 59:5 61:6 70:15 128:12 located 118:10 locations 39:2 lock 123:7 125:16 logic 42:14 logical 21:16 22:5 22:22 78:20 long 4:13 17:7 33:15 35:14 55:10 64:7 67:10 69:16 86:1 87:7 96:9 104:16 112:22 113:2,17 longer 10:14 120:4 120:6 long-term 59:2 77:22 look 20:14 28:5,6,11 30:1,2 36:16 37:1 37:5,7 53:8 55:13 55:16 103:2,10 107:3 117:10 122:4,13 123:6 124:10,11 126:4,8 looked 26:3 126:10 looking 27:22 36:10 53:1 91:4 125:19 looks 48:17 loose 16:10 49:9	108:6 Los 2:4,16 19:9 21:5 24:9,10 41:9 48:19 54:13 55:16,19 63:5,6 71:22 72:8 79:8,9 80:22 93:5 104:7,9,21 105:1,7 106:13,15 loss 17:5 lost 15:9,10 107:6 lot 49:9 50:4 88:15 88:17 112:14 120:3,6,19 124:9 129:4 low 19:2 108:6 lower 80:8 111:17 Lubrig 103:16 Lucey 2:2 33:5 37:19,21,22 lucky 116:7 lungs 16:22 18:22 Lupus 20:17	mandated 8:20 53:6 Manhattan 48:15 49:15,18 72:2 85:21 mankind 21:22 manner 79:16 manufacturing 78:11 92:2 map 63:21 94:2 Mara 2:4 16:12 21:1,3,3 March 1:7 19:4 80:15 marginalized 66:20 Marie 2:2 33:5 37:19,22 Mark 1:24 44:19 103:15 108:3,3,4 marks 40:3 Mars 113:15 Marsteller 93:6 Maryknoll 2:8 66:16,18 70:9 Maryland 108:8 mass 40:9 46:7 68:2 133:3 massacre 119:5 massive 25:22 27:3 43:18 material 27:20 68:8 68:11 72:22 materialized 123:2 materials 29:18 32:16 39:1 77:2 101:10 111:8 mathematician 72:2 matter 48:5 53:8 126:22 135:6 matters 28:22 mature 75:5 McMillan 62:21 66:10 mean 110:3 means 19:8 40:7,14 119:11,11 130:4 measure 127:7 measures 134:5	mediating 75:7 mediation 75:4 mediocre 15:19 meet 8:19 84:12 123:20 124:15,21 meeting 3:5,16,19 107:2 meetings 12:18 meets 126:6 megaton 115:3 member 63:1 81:19 126:18 members 5:3 43:6 47:7 56:20 62:6 97:10 100:8,12,16 121:5,14,18 128:10,14 membership 123:11 men 129:1 mentioned 28:17 29:7 52:5,15 98:11 115:20 mentioning 117:9 mere 110:2 merely 17:9 52:11 55:6 merit 78:1 mesa 106:13 mess 17:16 message 50:12 87:3 met 1:9 metallurgy 41:8 metaphor 35:10,13 Methodist 81:20 82:1 Mexico 57:22 58:2 79:10 80:13,17 100:10 103:20 104:4 105:16,18 106:3 Meyer 2:4 70:21 75:16,18,19 Michigan 114:16,17 microphone 6:1 47:16 72:7 113:12 middle 18:19 20:22 60:22 midnight 113:7
--	---	--	---	---

migratory 103:19	mode 15:8,13	multibillion 33:17	34:1,16 38:5 42:15	85:7 86:4
miles 18:10,11	moderator 113:9,10	multifaceted 12:10	54:16 57:6,21,22	negotiating 107:7
military 32:18	modern 35:16	multilateral 34:9	58:13 60:4,8 63:2	negotiators 26:14
43:17 57:8,12 58:3	modernizing 25:19	multitude 23:14	69:3,22 75:12 79:8	neighborhoods
58:19,22 69:13	43:22	Muslim 33:12 88:3	81:1,16 83:6,8	16:16
127:12 129:16,21	Moffat 2:5 56:9	Muslim-Christian	84:14 85:11 88:8	neither 16:9 59:19
Miller 44:19	62:21,22 63:1	1:15 2:18 88:10	90:3 92:14 99:21	102:1
million 14:5 15:20	65:18	muster 40:15	104:15,18,20	NEPA 42:15 54:6
18:11,12 19:18,19	Mohammad 86:18	mute 51:2	nations 45:11 46:22	76:15
19:19,20,20 60:18	Mohling 2:6 66:11	mutual 61:19	51:20 55:4 75:4	network 90:4
65:5 91:22 129:19	70:22 71:4 74:10	MX 12:1	79:13,22 82:17	Nevada 10:21 11:4
129:19	75:15		86:16 87:10 107:8	11:6 13:8 19:8
millions 102:4	moment 39:17	N	109:16 111:16	54:12 55:3 100:10
116:12	money 16:9 17:14	Nagasaki 63:18	nation's 3:10 11:19	104:19 113:18,22
mind 19:11 20:21	18:6 30:13 31:13	82:16 107:13	12:4 33:18 69:10	never 19:11 20:21
115:9,16	45:18,19 58:19	116:2,10 117:12	96:15	63:22 64:18 82:19
mindng 114:12	61:17 76:19 92:1	NAGLE 2:8	native 9:8 63:7	106:3
mined 19:1	93:13 99:13	name 5:11 6:1	104:11	new 1:18,19,25 2:19
minimally 101:22	118:22 119:9,13	16:13 21:3 30:20	natural 17:2,3 51:6	25:16 27:7,8 28:9
minimize 77:20	132:17 133:14	31:18 33:7 37:21	nature 88:14 110:18	28:14,15,19 29:6
minimized 22:8	monitor 77:6	40:18,20 41:2 42:4	Navajo 104:11	29:16,18 30:2,7,22
minimum 14:21	monitoring 131:14	51:4 56:11 62:22	106:6,9	31:9,14 34:4 35:2
29:2	Monsignor 127:14	66:13 71:4 72:8	near 57:21 63:6	36:10 37:12 39:4
mining 9:10 104:14	month 59:11	75:19 79:7 81:15	96:8,16	39:14,22 41:2
106:3 116:16	moral 34:19 40:7,13	84:19 88:2 90:1	nearby 114:22	43:19,21 44:10
minute 4:15,18 6:13	40:15 61:7 67:19	95:9,19 103:18	need 10:12 13:19	45:15 54:3,5 55:9
10:10 61:2 65:16	127:6,11,11 134:8	112:14 118:8	18:3 37:14 39:11	56:12,13,18 57:3,5
70:5 71:7 74:8	moratorium 35:2,7	126:17 128:8	42:20 49:1,11	57:10,22 58:1 59:6
93:20 99:3 106:21	83:13,18	132:4 133:12,19	54:18 55:2,8 62:9	59:7,12 60:2 61:7
116:18 125:2	morning 12:20	named 31:17	62:10,13 65:20	61:13 62:6,16
minutes 6:12 10:12	66:12	names 3:14 6:7	74:17,18,22 81:8	65:14 68:5 73:12
56:22 131:20	Morris 51:7	Nan 31:6 33:2 134:3	84:4 92:15 94:15	75:12 76:9 77:10
misconceived 85:14	Morrow 2:7 79:4	Nangle 126:15,16	99:5 101:19	77:15 79:9 80:13
misdirected 39:16	81:11,13,15	126:17	111:15 118:13	80:17 83:13 92:1
misguided 40:22	Moscow 80:9	nanomicroscope	119:9 120:8	92:19,20 95:11,19
missile 115:1	mother 96:18 118:9	108:7	122:12,13 123:19	95:21 97:20
missiles 115:2	119:17	narrated 63:18	124:16 126:4,13	100:10 101:19
missing 4:8 91:15	mothers 129:12	narrow 26:21	129:18 131:11	102:10 103:20
135:1	Mountain 72:13	nation 8:1,4 9:5	134:18	104:4 105:16
mission 14:18 31:19	113:2 114:1	17:13,22 19:11	needed 41:15 70:19	106:3 111:10,21
36:15,16,19,20	move 31:15 80:8	48:14 67:15 80:6	78:12	112:16 124:13,21
37:2 48:4	115:14	85:22 104:12	needless 115:8	131:8
missionaries 66:18	moved 85:6	124:22	needs 11:20 16:3	newer 61:14,21
70:10	movement 59:9	national 1:1,20 2:4	53:2 55:12 56:5	69:6
missionary 129:5	85:6 126:19	2:10,16 3:6 16:2,8	94:19 96:2 126:7	news 114:14
missions 34:16	movements 114:7	21:5,9,13,17 22:10	negative 61:10	Nick 2:13 37:20
mitigate 70:4	movies 64:5	24:15 25:8,10 27:2	negatively 85:18	41:20 42:4
mobile 14:20	moving 95:21	32:21 33:9,10,12	negotiate 51:22	nightmarish 115:15

84:22 95:15 99:22 112:16 115:11 121:4 128:8 organizational 6:3 83:7 organizations 7:18 33:11,13 42:11 76:12 88:6,9 90:4 original 91:2 Orrock 31:6 33:3 OSF 2:2 ought 109:8 outdated 44:9 93:16 outlined 8:6,10 83:9 outlines 7:5 outlining 9:21 outmoded 39:9 43:14 125:18 outside 129:6,9 overall 16:2 24:21 58:21 overhaul 39:12 overhead 129:14 overriding 27:17 oversight 60:10 overwhelming 69:13 O'Connell 2:8 66:10,12,13 70:6	Park 115:6 part 7:16 15:1 26:20 35:1 49:7 72:21 86:10 94:11 103:9 104:17 113:20 115:1 128:20 partial 29:9 participant's 4:3 participate 121:8 participation 4:1 93:12 particles 60:20 particular 3:18 67:22 76:1 particularly 28:18 41:3 97:3 101:7 127:3 partnership 8:8 88:5,11 parts 4:10 28:18 33:14 54:5 party 3:18 Paso 105:17 passed 113:5 pastoral 40:5 81:20 path 34:17 127:8 Patricia 1:15 84:17 87:22 88:2 patriotic 12:7 Paul 127:5,5 Pax 2:8 Pax-Christi 126:18 128:12,14 pay 57:8 payer 8:15 25:22 30:13 45:15 82:22 93:13 97:22 payers 57:7 99:6 102:2 paying 13:16,17 58:18 peace 1:16,17,22 2:5,12,13,19 7:1 9:20 40:4,5 42:5 56:12,13,15 62:6 63:1 72:14 82:1,12 85:1,2,2 95:22	100:6,7,19 101:2 102:7 103:4 114:5 119:10 120:22 126:19 128:18 peaceful 75:3 100:20 Pearl 64:6 PEIS 3:9 4:20,22 5:4,18 12:12 26:20 83:3 103:10 Pentagon 28:22 people 6:9 18:11,12 19:20 20:21 26:8 26:15 36:6 41:3 42:17 43:9 44:21 44:22 45:3 49:17 66:19,20 67:9,18 70:7,15 71:4 72:3 75:7 88:18,19 89:1 89:4 92:6,19 95:4 106:6 108:22 109:20 115:17 116:8 118:6 121:7 132:7,10 133:2 peoples 87:16 104:11 people's 42:12 perceived 134:7 percent 11:2 18:15 20:2 61:5,5 80:21 81:1 percents 19:6 perfect 73:7 134:11 period 5:22 6:16 36:4,5 90:18 92:16 121:13 periods 14:19 permanence 127:13 permit 18:15 perpetual 62:2 Perry 26:11 134:3 person 6:8 67:15 personal 23:22 24:4 128:19 perspective 13:13 perspectives 104:2 Peru 129:7 130:3 Peruvian 129:15	petrographic 71:10 phenomenon 130:15 phones 51:1 physical 49:2 physicist 71:20 105:5 physicists 105:6 physics 83:20,22 114:18 piece 32:3 91:15 106:22 Piketton 118:11 119:16 pile 77:6 78:4 pit 29:6 35:3,17 78:8 83:14 101:15 102:5 103:14 pits 24:11 29:4 55:9 55:10 73:17 83:15 place 14:11 16:5 35:2 55:21 66:7 106:8 122:11 126:3 placed 12:21 placenta 97:5 places 101:11 105:19 118:12 119:16 placing 83:12 plan 25:19 27:14 28:18 31:7 33:18 34:5 38:17 41:13 48:9 53:14 54:5 60:1 65:12 97:14 97:21 101:18 104:17 105:20,21 106:1,15 109:3 119:19 122:1 124:20 125:5,9,15 125:17 126:12 134:17 planes 129:15,17 planet 10:4 66:5 89:8 113:14,20 119:20 120:6 planning 43:17 91:22	plans 7:5,8 8:5,7 9:3 33:21 59:14 plant 19:18 39:4,16 39:22 48:22 61:4,5 91:18,19 92:2 plants 29:19 67:9 plausible 8:18 played 85:8 player 15:20 playing 116:20 plead 134:15 please 4:6 5:22 6:5 6:11 87:14 pleased 48:17 plunge 117:4 Plus 50:4 plutonium 28:20 29:4,6 35:3,18 38:13 54:4 55:9 83:14 101:15 point 30:5,14 59:10 59:18,20 73:20 91:5 92:18 94:1 106:20 113:7 116:21 pointed 123:18 125:4 points 13:14 29:15 89:16 poison 16:22 67:11 poisoned 95:3 poisons 20:20 policies 42:22 43:12 69:18,20 87:7 policy 8:11 40:13 42:12,16 53:9 56:15 64:15 84:21 85:4 92:15 93:15 103:13 107:15 111:1 122:3,5 125:5,8 127:20 128:16 political 32:17 34:7 54:1 110:4 pollutants 111:8 pollute 105:19 110:3 polluter 17:13
P				
package 4:3 packet 4:6 pads 8:18 page 76:3 pages 26:2 33:15 Paine 2:10 47:13 50:21 51:4,5 Pakistan 86:13 117:3 Pamela 2:5 56:9 62:21,22 panel 15:6 Pantex 55:16,19 paper 106:22 paraphrase 16:7 parent 24:2 parents 73:16				

polluters 17:21	134:5	priests 66:18	101:16 102:6,15	proposals 35:15
pollution 23:18	practitioner 119:18	primaries 29:1	102:18 103:6,14	41:19 109:11
77:17 110:19	preciousness 10:3	Primarily 100:21	104:21 108:16	propose 34:20
poor 40:10 66:20	prefer 13:15	primary 60:2	111:21	83:10 91:8 102:12
70:11	preferences 12:16	Prince 50:6	professional 15:19	102:17
Pope 127:5	preferred 21:16	Princeton 50:9	21:8 79:11 84:4	proposed 5:17
pops 122:6	22:22 23:16 25:19	principal 21:4	professor 114:17,18	11:15,17 38:10,17
populations 107:10	34:5 47:3 79:12	principle 37:17	profit 18:4,7	41:7 42:19 45:7
portion 15:21 48:21	81:9 101:5	priorities 57:7 58:1	program 12:2 15:22	53:14 82:7 91:6
ports 99:12	premature 25:21	58:13 124:15,20	21:5 45:6,15 51:5	92:17 94:17
posed 81:4	28:8	priority 61:19	57:2 75:19 85:3	proposing 43:19
poses 20:7	preparations 87:4	private 21:10 59:19	88:14 91:4 123:12	proposition 29:8
posing 36:6	prepare 134:16	privatized 54:5 92:1	124:3 127:22	prospect 55:17
position 3:18 11:15	prepared 51:8	privileged 100:12	programmatic 1:2	prospects 28:1
48:5 82:5,14 93:14	112:5 119:22	prize 49:22 85:2	3:8 91:11,16	protect 45:22 76:19
positions 80:4	preparing 83:1	probability 19:22	programs 4:17 5:15	protecting 113:17
positive 59:2 80:21	preponderance	probably 22:5	58:15 78:10	113:18
posses 67:4	130:18	35:13 98:7 106:10	progress 22:21	protection 20:7
possessing 68:3	preschoolers 120:9	problem 104:22	progressive 51:22	22:1 24:1 111:18
82:18 108:12	prescient 74:12	123:14	project 3:12 4:21	Protestant 33:11
possession 47:6	present 1:13 2:1 5:7	problems 25:9 66:2	31:11 48:16 49:15	protests 9:9
possibilities 56:6	64:21 108:21	67:21 103:3 105:1	49:19 57:7 58:1,13	proud 51:7
possibility 27:11	presentation 4:19	133:16	60:16 72:2 85:21	proven 14:5
110:12	5:2 44:4	procedures 62:12	121:10 123:8	provide 5:4 78:21
possible 12:11 30:6	presentations 42:3	proceeding 27:6	projects 36:1	102:18 117:20
31:22 48:1 72:19	presented 7:4 88:7	87:1	proliferation 27:12	121:2
118:20	preserve 22:19 48:4	process 42:15 76:15	34:1,13 37:3,9,17	provided 11:13 86:5
possibly 34:3 96:6	48:14 50:11	85:8 103:10	46:21 68:16 78:16	provides 79:15
109:22 111:5	preserving 50:18	120:20 121:8,21	86:7,22 107:21,22	providing 6:2 47:22
posted 114:15	president 17:11	121:22	123:19	provocative 25:20
postural 44:11	28:9,10 31:5 33:2	processing 54:4	promise 9:22 10:5	131:7
posture 28:11 44:7	52:8 95:10 97:20	55:18 116:17	132:14	provoke 27:9
52:6 92:21 97:18	130:15 134:12	produce 13:8 20:11	promises 64:22	proximity 24:3
122:9,16	presidential 26:18	38:14 39:5 55:9	promoting 9:16	prudence 21:20
potential 13:2 15:16	125:14	produced 64:16	56:16	prudently 79:15
22:20 23:4,5 96:11	presiding 1:12	producing 7:21	promotion 49:12	public 1:5,9 3:6 5:3
potentially 109:22	press 47:7	20:20 73:17	pronouncements	6:10 12:18 21:9
pounds 18:13,16	pressing 84:12	108:13 133:3	125:13	36:1 37:4,15 39:8
pour 45:14	presumably 45:19	product 36:17	properly 72:15	43:6 47:19 48:1
poverty 70:9 129:3	presume 54:9	production 7:19	properties 48:12,20	51:12 57:17 58:19
power 67:4,16	presumes 54:7	19:17 27:7 28:19	50:13	77:19 80:11 81:7
69:12 98:17	pretty 126:22	34:3,21 35:4 38:18	property 49:2	81:14 83:8 84:21
112:20	prevent 42:1 46:10	38:21 54:16 57:4	proposal 28:7 31:14	90:21 93:7,11
powerful 85:8 114:4	59:13 61:10	59:8 60:3,15 61:4	33:20 38:12 39:11	121:2,9,13,15,18
powers 52:2 86:12	prevented 60:10	61:11,20 64:20	41:1 62:7,17 85:14	122:2,4
86:15,20	previous 80:19	67:2 73:21 77:9,13	85:15 93:8 108:10	Pueblos 104:12
PR 93:9,13	previously 90:15	77:16 83:14 90:6	108:10,15 109:10	Pulitzer 49:22
practical 67:20	92:8	91:9 94:6 96:12	112:8 117:22	purpose 76:16,22

117:18 purposes 89:15 96:1 pursing 34:16 pursual 37:12 pursue 76:7 pursuing 37:16 pursuit 87:18 put 10:15 18:4 23:10 41:14 74:19 97:20 101:17 115:11 puts 77:13 P-R-O-C-E-E-D... 3:1 p.m 135:6	14:10 51:16 91:8 108:16 ranging 109:1 rate 36:7 50:10 ratified 7:15 ratify 55:7 reach 19:5 65:8 reactor 48:19 reactors 59:9 read 26:3 31:4 33:13 44:15 45:1 114:14 122:10 134:1 reading 45:2 ready 5:20 65:14 84:10 reaffirm 46:5 real 44:11 75:2 112:7 121:6 124:13 125:21 126:6 reality 49:8 69:16 realization 117:16 realize 105:19 really 13:14 17:15 47:20 66:8 74:11 87:7 93:4 103:8 109:12,17,18 112:3,14 115:14 116:3 121:12 124:14 reason 26:21 28:13 30:12 45:14 55:8 67:6,18 86:15 102:4 107:2 reasonable 27:5,5 28:4,5 51:16 56:4 65:4 78:2 reasonably 27:1 54:20 119:18 reasons 47:1 67:3 93:1 Reassertion 134:4 rebuild 33:18 recapture 37:14 receive 4:6 5:17 82:6 received 4:2 36:5,8	92:7 recipient 85:2 reclamation 71:11 recognize 94:4 recommendation 38:22 recommended 32:12 recommends 102:7 103:5 reconciliation 85:1 record 5:6 51:9 79:14 80:11 81:9 91:2,20 107:3 111:13 120:14 rectify 87:10 recycled 55:12 redevelopment 9:6 redirected 84:12 reduce 14:21 34:1 39:2 48:11 78:17 85:16 reduced 22:8 reducing 69:7 reduction 51:22 80:2 reductions 24:21 reemphasizing 43:16 refer 36:11 122:15 reference 91:17 references 53:3 referendum 92:14 referred 38:2 122:6 referring 41:5 reflect 44:11 51:20 119:12 reflected 43:12 44:12 refrain 76:8 reframing 37:2 Refuge 72:18 refurbished 55:11 78:11 refusal 86:10 regime 46:16 registered 80:18 registration 4:2	5:11 regulation 60:11 regulations 60:9 61:9 regulatory 59:21 73:4 reignite 33:22 reinvestment 127:22 reinvigorate 46:15 reiterate 92:22 reiterated 82:13 reject 62:7 rejected 7:7 35:16 35:17,18,19,21,22 rejuvenate 45:15 relates 110:1 relations 93:7 relationships 70:15 relatives 104:13 release 111:7 relevant 23:8 reliability 15:17 77:7 reliable 35:21 43:20 67:7 68:12 78:3 101:18,22 relies 44:6 religious 2:3 33:11 33:16 38:4,6 40:1 41:12 83:8 88:7,8 89:17 114:7 128:11 relocation 11:17 rely 8:7 remain 16:4 25:6 69:2 87:6 remainder 15:2 remaining 6:13 55:6 77:6 134:12 remarks 6:6,11 11:12 51:10 remember 64:6 72:1,8 113:3,9 114:2 remind 50:22 reminded 81:20 86:18 98:2 112:22	130:14 removal 60:17 removed 92:5 renew 108:10 renewable 133:4 renewed 59:15 125:11 renewing 108:13 111:1,20 repeatedly 86:18 replace 67:6 replacement 35:22 41:8 43:20 83:14 101:18 replacing 68:11 report 8:10,13 13:8 14:15 28:21 32:13 52:6,11,15,17 106:7 122:10 reporter 5:5,20 6:6 132:3 repository 12:4 represent 10:22 62:6 98:18,22 110:8 representative 44:17 45:4 46:3 127:15 representatives 43:5 127:9,16 represented 44:16 55:15 104:11 representing 38:6 76:10 84:19 100:7 133:8 represents 14:2 23:19 31:1 66:17 76:18 98:14 reprocessing 8:15 reproductions 28:1 repugnant 41:3 request 38:19 94:14 requested 51:15 require 23:6 required 24:16 32:6 44:10 60:17 80:9 requirement 54:21 requirements 27:2
Q				
Quaker-based 84:22 question 58:8 91:13 127:17 130:10 questions 5:8 88:21 quite 74:11 93:18 104:9 115:9 127:18 quote 14:15 134:1 quoted 40:18				
R				
race 33:22 40:9 82:11 131:9 radiation 19:2 20:1 20:5,6,7,12 radio 19:7 radioactive 8:17 9:4 9:10 17:16 18:13 19:7 59:16 106:11 111:8 112:17,21 116:13 Rain 63:19 Rainwater 2:12 118:3 120:16,17 120:21 125:4 raise 4:6 91:1 93:2 raises 91:13 ranchers 106:9 rand 124:14 range 11:2,5,6				

research 28:15 102:14 106:22 107:1	Reverend 2:8 126:15	row 132:1	Savannah 96:8,10 96:21 97:2,7,7,9	100:20 102:11,17 102:22 103:7,13
reside 79:9	review 5:21 52:6 58:14 92:21 97:18	rule 8:3,3	save 49:1 76:19	securing 119:10
residents 57:3 58:1 58:5 61:6 62:16	122:9	rules 3:22 5:21	saved 130:2 132:17	security 1:1 2:7 3:7 8:2 16:3,8 21:9
residue 65:2	reviews 53:6	ruling 7:12	savings 30:6	23:9,9,21 24:5 25:10,16 27:2
resolution 32:19 56:16 82:14	Rheumatoid 20:18	Rumsfeld 52:7,10	saw 63:14,21 105:5 106:6 129:14	31:22 32:13,22 34:2 39:12 44:3,11
Resolutions 86:6	Rhodes 50:1	Rumsfeld's 52:18	saying 64:17	62:19 63:3 66:4,5 69:3,11,17,22 70:1
resources 2:10 9:18 45:20 51:6 65:14	Richard 50:1 63:6	run 31:11 111:11	says 36:3,12 53:11 122:12 128:20	74:16 75:12 77:7 79:17 80:5 81:16
68:10 77:14 89:14 130:3 131:1	rid 54:14 132:15	runs 3:19 59:20	scale 110:9	83:7 84:14 85:3,12 87:15 98:10
respect 12:9 87:3	ridding 41:10	rural 70:13	scanning 108:7	122:13 126:6
respects 26:6	right 18:12 42:3 50:4 66:15 71:7	rush 28:13 29:5	scarce 39:15 68:10	see 46:1 49:16 64:5 72:9 124:11
respond 13:2 80:5 111:19	91:7 99:1 107:5	Russell 44:17 46:14	scare 45:20	seeing 109:3
responding 5:8 111:16	rights 8:2 56:18	Russia 98:17	scarred 63:15 64:1	seek 27:10 47:4 87:10 108:19
responds 124:13	Rio 105:15,15,20 106:14	Russian 116:20	scene 38:9	128:18 131:5
response 22:10 24:14 109:17	risk 20:8 50:14 89:7	Rutgers 117:1	schedule 3:20	seeking 104:17 129:8
122:19	risks 13:5 14:18 34:5	<hr/> S <hr/>	scheduled 135:2	seen 70:17 98:7 121:20
responses 121:19	river 59:18 96:9,10 96:21 97:3,7,7,7,9	Sacramento 103:22	school 119:8	segment 4:11,12,13 5:1,3,13
responsibilities 63:5	rivers 8:21	sacred 41:4	schools 45:19 70:16 99:11	selection 13:3
responsibility 13:1 23:22 24:4 60:15	RNPJC 73:2	sacrifice 104:15,18 104:21	Schultz 134:2	self 74:5
67:14 132:6	Robert 4:15 5:13 8:10 50:2 51:7	sadly 96:3	science 75:7,10,11 80:3 114:10,11	Seminole 49:19
responsible 24:18	Robock 116:22	safe 31:21 75:1 78:3 81:2 101:22	scientific 22:11,14 23:2,6 25:3,7	senate 26:11
responsiveness 23:15	robs 40:10	105:22 106:2,4 118:7,14 124:18	39:20 79:19 84:6 84:11	Senator 31:6 33:2 44:17,18,19 46:14
rest 19:11 49:3 65:9 89:8	Rock 105:10,10 106:7	124:19 131:12	scientist 2:20 64:16 71:12 85:21 108:5	sending 87:2
restoring 104:20	rocket 75:7,9	safely 72:15	scientists 84:9 116:22 133:20	senior 8:11 85:21
rests 9:15	Rocky 72:12,13,21 102:9,10	safer 21:20 24:17 25:2 34:18 61:15	scoping 12:18 36:4 51:13	sense 45:17 116:6 124:5,9
result 13:3 109:20	Rohr 63:6	61:16,21 69:9 70:20 99:12 101:3	Scott 73:14	sent 121:5
resulting 77:16	role 3:18 39:14 43:16 85:9	102:11,16,22 103:7,12 111:12	scourge 71:17	sentences 119:22
results 70:17 78:8 109:14,16	room 1:9 14:1 22:7 50:3 113:6 124:1	safety 15:16 24:4 77:6 101:8 118:20	seats 3:4	SERENITY 2:22 120:8
resurp 34:2	124:17 131:6	131:2	second 6:8,19 14:8 35:3 54:14 63:16	serious 130:11
resurrect 66:3 102:9	Rosalie 17:17 19:16	sake 75:5 87:14	76:9 79:18 110:20	seriously 7:9 67:13 87:11
return 12:8 22:16 57:11 58:2	rose 40:18	sakes 41:22	secretaries 26:9,13	serve 3:15 101:6
returned 57:8	Rosemary 1:17 100:4 103:16,18	salaries 57:9	secretary 8:11 26:11 52:7,9,17	served 11:19 17:17
revamp 31:8	Roth 2:13 37:20 41:20,22 42:4	salary 15:19	sector 55:22	service 21:9,21,22
	Rotblat 85:22	Sam 26:12 134:3	secure 21:21 24:17 25:2 32:16 68:10	
	Roth 2:13 37:20 41:20,22 42:4	Sandia 54:16 55:16 80:22	69:21,21 70:8 74:14 78:3 81:3	
	roulette 116:20	sane 56:14		
		sat 71:15 93:3		
		satisfy 78:15		
		Saturday 63:12		

41:14 84:20 115:20 services 26:12 serving 6:14 session 133:7 set 22:11 sets 46:10 setting 32:4 seven 18:10 53:14 53:18 97:17 severe 17:20 Shaer 31:4 33:1 Shakespeare's 40:17 Shanti 73:14 share 114:8 shared 22:6 64:10 sheep 106:10 Sheryl 50:21 56:8 56:11 shift 70:8 shifts 124:14 Shock 19:3 short 103:4 Shoshone 113:4,17 show 45:11 120:14 showing 25:1 shown 90:20 shows 29:21 94:2 Shultz 26:10 Shultz-Kissinger 32:1 shut 60:14 72:13 132:21 shutting 108:16 shy 12:6 sick 73:18 side 47:16 104:4 109:14,15 112:20 sided 109:19 sides 109:13 sign 38:1 signatories 88:6 signatory 45:10 signed 5:10 6:10 32:22 88:8 131:19 significant 11:7 60:10 77:22	significantly 77:12 similar 7:6 26:18 48:6 simple 12:11 67:3 simply 37:11 62:1 108:16 111:7 116:16 single 115:1 sinister 40:19 sins 23:14 sister 13:10 17:16 19:16 37:22 sisters 38:7 66:19 site 9:4,5 11:6 12:4 19:9 48:19 54:3 55:3 60:13,22 67:11 96:9,10,21 97:3,8,9 104:19 sites 8:21 9:3 42:21 53:13,17 90:8 94:8 94:13,16 95:5 96:11,16 99:14 sits 18:10,11 six 24:13 33:15 98:14,16 size 53:21 98:2,5,15 99:1 sized 98:22 skill 59:3 skills 66:2 slaughter 119:7 slim 122:10 slums 70:13 small 17:1 97:8 smaller 21:20 23:17 24:8,16 38:19 53:21 61:15,21 101:3 smell 40:19 Smolen 4:16 5:14 35:12 social 1:17 40:1 82:11 114:6 society 26:7 125:12 soil 8:21 18:2 60:18 60:21 113:19 soils 68:3 solutions 103:2	solve 133:16 solving 82:20 Somalia 18:19 somebody 135:1 someday 120:5 son 73:11 son-in-law 73:15 104:8 sorry 34:20 92:20 134:22 sort 29:12 50:16 104:5 122:5 124:8 130:10,20 sound 23:1 98:19 sounds 49:12 source 59:22 sources 41:16 South 129:4 Southwest 55:13 106:18,19 Soviet 53:12 107:17 114:20 Soviets 115:2 space 80:2 spanking 111:10 spare 36:15 speak 3:21 21:7 30:19 57:1 93:10 99:15 100:4,14,22 103:9 109:4 112:13 115:17 126:21 131:17,20 131:22 speaker 6:8,18 95:12 115:19 116:15 120:15 126:15 speakers 51:3 122:8 124:12 126:1 131:19 speaking 7:2 128:3 132:6 speaks 41:12 82:2 special 29:17 101:10 specific 24:9 34:22 59:5 specifically 11:16	57:2 75:21 93:2 96:22 speed 77:18 SPEIS 7:3,20 43:13 47:4 51:11 76:2,4 spend 57:12 58:9,12 62:8 88:14,16 91:22 97:21 102:8 spending 31:13 57:8 57:12 58:3,17,19 59:1 61:17 65:5 84:8 93:12 128:21 132:20 spent 58:4,19 89:14 119:13 125:18 129:4,18 spill 106:8,12 spiritual 41:5 113:4 spoke 127:16 spoken 92:6,19 108:22 127:10 128:9 sponsored 42:11 spread 46:10 spurring 27:11 squander 8:14 stabilize 65:20 66:1 staff 3:12 4:7 81:15 121:1 stage 50:17 stakes 130:5 Stan 72:1 stand 21:7 83:4 standard 14:17,17 standards 86:19 111:17 standby 15:2 standing 129:8,13 standpoint 124:6 stapled 36:12 stark 86:3 start 6:18 91:14 118:4 started 3:4 48:16 starting 66:7 state 2:19 26:9,14 31:2,6 33:2 43:5 44:18,19 45:4	56:12,13,19,21 57:3,6,9,10,15 59:12 62:7,16 73:1 80:13,17 82:6 103:21 133:8 stated 9:15 32:4 40:11 statement 1:3 3:8 5:21 6:5 26:1 31:4 33:10,14 38:1,3 43:11 51:8 69:4 79:1 88:7,12 89:18 91:11,17 109:5,8,9 111:6 112:4,6 statements 6:10 44:22 76:1 114:4 states 14:4,15 22:1 31:3 32:15 37:7 45:5 53:14,18 55:7 57:7 61:7 64:10 68:18 69:16 74:6 75:1 78:17 80:8 81:5 87:13,15 94:14 104:18 107:13 108:11 111:19,19 114:21 117:11,20 127:19 127:21 128:13 State's 60:2 statistic 53:10 statistical 17:4 statistically 17:1 statistics 17:9 steal 68:9 stealth 12:2 step 5:22 21:17 22:5 23:1 41:10 59:13 Stephen 2:20 133:19 steps 9:22 10:15 34:8,10,22 83:12 stewards 67:14 stewardship 43:22 78:9 91:3 stock 45:12 77:6 78:4 stockpile 29:2 32:9 39:3 43:21 53:19
--	--	--	--	---

54:13 62:11 77:9 78:9 80:8 91:3 stockpiles 64:21 stolen 101:12 stop 22:5 32:16 60:1 64:20 82:18 97:12 113:22 116:20 120:9 storage 9:10 55:20 59:8 61:11 119:1 stored 105:9 storing 119:16 story 61:8 strangers 70:14 strategies 32:11,14 46:6 123:20 strategist 80:12 strategizing 39:18 strategy 39:13 69:3 stretches 123:9 strict 131:13 strike 62:3,4 87:8 strong 39:21 strongly 39:3 46:8 62:17 121:12 structural 59:4 structure 110:5 structures 14:21 struggle 129:1 studied 18:8 76:14 83:19 studies 39:14 45:11 study 58:14,16 59:1 76:6 78:1,8 84:1 101:20 116:22 stuff 50:4 subject 11:3,9 60:8 submission 62:1 119:4 submit 42:17 80:10 submitted 35:15 43:9 51:13 52:10 100:16 submitting 11:10 33:10 35:8 44:20 47:10 66:13 87:9 100:17 substance 97:4	substitute 78:7 suburban 60:5 subversive 86:20 sufficient 45:12 55:1 suggest 102:22 121:9 suggested 76:4 suit 86:16 summarily 130:13 summarize 11:14 43:10 66:15 summary 33:14 36:3 summer 129:14 summon 40:7 sunshine 129:13 superiority 69:14 supersonic 129:14 129:17 supplemental 1:2 3:7,9 4:19,22 5:4 5:18 83:2 91:10,16 supply 62:13 support 8:1 21:8,15 36:2 46:5,8 51:19 54:13 57:3 58:7 67:1 77:1 81:2 101:2,6,9,14 115:12 119:18 supported 58:6 supporters 31:20 supporting 59:13 79:22 92:8 supreme 7:16 sure 32:14 50:3,15 73:21 118:11 128:9 131:5 surety 15:16 surface 48:12 surplus 55:10,21 surprised 88:18 surveillance 83:15 survey 58:1 80:11 80:15 survivors 63:18 Susan 1:23 31:4 32:22 88:1 89:21	90:1 134:21 suspect 68:14 sustained 120:15 sweat 74:20 sweet 40:19 symbolically 45:9 symptomatic 69:10 system 20:13,17 46:1 97:12 systems 29:1 99:9 133:4 S-57 76:4 S.W 1:10 <hr/> T table 4:2 5:12 71:15 take 3:3 13:17 34:8 36:15 44:14 46:4 56:22 59:1 60:15 67:13 85:12 124:11 126:3 133:9 taken 17:14 22:9 takes 26:21 talk 3:12 26:18 29:15 121:14 talked 72:7 122:8 talking 30:3,8 37:9 73:5 88:15 96:5 talks 122:17,17 Tammy 44:18 46:3 tangible 49:8 Taos 73:16 Tara 2:7 79:4 81:11 81:15 target 48:12 targeted 115:3 task 12:15 taught 85:22 tax 8:14 17:14 25:22 30:13 45:14 57:7 82:22 93:12 97:22 99:6 102:1 118:22 119:9 teach 103:22 teacher 114:11,11 teachings 40:2 tech 14:20	technical 23:3 25:3 25:7 26:15 40:7,14 79:19 technological 39:20 technology 8:16 46:11 61:18 68:8 Ted 1:14 4:19 5:6 6:14 81:6 90:12 133:21 tell 19:15 36:16,19 71:6 Telling 106:8 temperature 108:7 ten 18:12 52:20,20 128:4 tens 116:11 125:6 126:8 128:13 term 69:17 74:11 terms 21:22 26:19 94:17 111:3 122:18 127:17 terror 86:2 87:11 terrorism 46:17 123:17 125:22 terrorist 28:2 68:1 68:6 terrorists 27:18,21 101:13 terrorize 65:19 terrorizing 87:10 test 11:2,5,6,17 14:10,15 16:5 19:9 54:3 55:3,5 104:19 tested 61:6 107:18 testified 97:16 testify 41:18 testifying 90:12 testimonies 130:12 testimony 38:10 87:9 128:20 130:8 testing 9:11 11:4,22 14:11 19:17 22:17 35:7 54:11 83:18 113:21 116:15 Texas 100:11 thank 6:20,21 7:17 10:11 16:10,11 20:3,22 21:6 25:10	30:14,15,18 32:19 33:3,4 37:18,21 41:19 47:11,12 50:19,20 56:6,8 62:19,20 65:18 66:8 70:6,20 75:14 75:15 79:2,3 81:10 81:13 84:15 87:21 87:22 89:20,21 95:6,7 99:14,16 100:2,3 103:15,17 108:2 112:9,12 118:1,2 120:13 121:1 126:13,14 126:16 131:15 134:19,20 135:4 thanking 118:5 thanks 10:17 81:6 106:5 112:11 133:17 135:2 theft 128:22,22 themes 89:4 theology 84:1 theoretical 71:20 thing 25:17 93:22 107:19 117:16 122:11 things 18:3 52:14 66:7 90:14 120:21 121:17 124:16 133:1 think 13:20 22:3 25:18 26:5,20 27:5 30:12 35:13 36:7,9 37:16 48:5 49:9 53:10 55:12 90:18 91:12 92:3,12 93:18 94:20 98:1 99:9 109:7,21 110:18 112:2 114:10 120:8,9 121:5 123:22 133:21 134:8,22 thinking 39:10 43:14 107:12 120:1 third 31:2 57:10 63:19 111:6
---	--	---	--	--

Thomas 2:15 132:4 132:5	tired 104:16	85:13 87:2,17	128:15	united 14:4 22:1
thorough 122:2	title 63:18	89:19 91:6 93:8	turning 10:13	37:6 45:5 55:7
thought 73:11,17 95:20 98:10 115:16 129:21 130:16	today 11:12 13:12 21:7,15 30:20 36:8 38:17 49:10 57:16 58:8 62:5 66:15 69:14 81:14 82:2 83:4,9 85:10,17 99:16 100:6 103:9 108:5 112:14 113:2 114:2 115:14,17 121:16 128:3,10 130:8 132:18	94:18,21 96:13 98:1 102:3 108:9 109:11 118:14 121:20 122:1,20 123:4 124:10 128:2 131:5,6	two 4:10 6:7 13:14 32:15 39:14 46:18 49:22 53:6 54:2,18 59:5 67:3,5 68:6 68:13 73:9,11 88:5 108:18 109:13,18 119:22 130:3 134:11	64:10 68:17 69:16 74:6 75:1 80:8 81:19 82:1 87:15 104:18 107:13 108:11 111:19 114:21 117:11,19 124:18 127:19,21 128:13
thoughts 114:8	today's 38:8 44:11	transformations 25:4	type 58:16 125:8	universal 32:11 66:1 127:1
thousands 26:2,2 51:12,14 55:10 68:3 99:18 116:11 125:6 126:9 128:13	tolerate 86:1	transformed 70:18	types 29:1	University 13:8 71:21 103:21 108:8 114:18
threat 7:13 28:2 65:15 69:14 96:19 110:8,15,21 122:22 124:8	Tonopah 11:1,2,5 11:13 12:19 14:10	transportation 61:12	<hr/> U <hr/>	unjust 86:2 118:18
threaten 61:22,22 66:8	tons 60:17	transporting 9:4	Ulam's 72:1	unleash 125:19
threatened 93:15 105:8,11 116:1	top 36:14 61:18	treated 12:9 52:12	ultimate 9:14 16:4 87:19 96:19	unmanageable 8:17
threatening 68:14 86:2 108:12	total 43:8 100:1	treaties 34:15 64:20 65:1	ultimately 24:10,14	unnecessary 25:21 28:18 39:16 67:7
threatens 39:6 131:8	totally 72:11 118:13	treaty 7:14 10:2 37:3,9,17 39:7 43:15 45:10 46:8 46:21 55:5 78:16 80:10 85:8 86:22 92:9 102:20 123:21	UN 127:10,15	unpopulated 14:3
threats 23:4 68:1 70:4 81:4 87:5,8 110:6 122:16,18 122:21 123:2,3,6,8 123:14,16,22 124:2,2 126:2	touches 88:21	trees 105:13	unacceptability 127:11	unprecedented 8:16 22:17 59:12 110:9
three 10:13 20:14 20:15 32:16 35:4 63:14 64:5 96:18 109:12 121:19 134:12	tough 120:18	triangle 55:13,15	unacceptable 9:3 30:12 89:7 119:9	unproven 8:15
thrust 8:4 123:13	town 11:1	tricky 73:5	unanticipated 80:5 122:21 123:6	untenable 8:6
Tim 66:13	toxic 9:2 17:15,18	tries 49:16	unborn 96:21	untold 84:8
time 5:16 6:7 30:14 32:20 36:15 44:14 52:16 57:1 60:11 64:8 65:13 77:15 88:15,17 115:14 116:19 117:19 125:14 128:15 131:20	toxins 18:14	trillion 65:8	uncondition 82:3	update 11:12
Timothy 2:8 66:10	toys 129:20	tritium 96:22 97:3,6 97:10,13	unconventional 87:12	upgrade 14:20
	traditional 106:8	trouble 37:11	underdeveloped 129:17	upgrading 25:19 58:10
	train 50:7	true 10:6 13:18 26:6 76:18 115:18 117:20 131:6	undergraduate 83:20	uranium 9:10 18:18 18:22 54:4 55:17 55:21 60:4 62:13 104:14 106:3,8 116:16
	trained 14:6	truly 74:13 123:5	underground 22:16 54:11	uranium-238 18:17
	training 11:5,21 59:3	try 47:18 48:4,10 50:11 51:9 72:14 132:1	undermines 68:15	urge 34:7 41:13 82:16 85:10 87:16 99:18 121:12
	transcribe 5:5,20	trying 73:2 102:9 110:10 113:22	undermining 86:21	urged 97:19
	transferred 55:22	TTR 14:20 15:1,9 16:5	underpinning 22:14 23:7 24:20 25:3	urging 99:19
	transfers 32:17	TTRN 15:7	understand 71:3 88:22 110:11	urine 61:7
	transformation 1:4 3:9 4:4,21 7:4,20 8:6 9:1,17 10:6 11:12 12:11,12 14:14 29:19 31:7 33:20 40:21 41:4 42:13,19 43:1 44:2 44:13 45:8 57:5,18 61:16 62:9 67:1,3 67:22 68:16 69:1,9 70:19 74:11,13 75:3 76:18 83:2,11	TUESDAY 1:6	undertaken 22:9	urine 61:7
		tunneling 108:7	unfortunate 124:22	USA 126:18
		turn 11:20 46:1 51:1 64:12,14	Unfortunately 96:3	use 7:12,13 9:17 18:18 64:18 70:2 82:4,19 95:22 106:16 108:13 115:22 132:16
			Union 2:20 53:12 107:18 114:20 133:20	
			unique 36:22 88:13	

useless 130:7	vow 82:19	Washington 1:10	53:19 54:3,5,11,14	56:9,10,11 61:3
USSR 107:8	vu 38:8	20:4 42:4 57:16	54:21 55:3,15	West 2:12 120:22
utmost 32:21	vulnerable 40:10	63:10 84:21	56:17 57:14 59:8	Westchester 59:10
U.K 19:3,5,8	69:19,19	wasn't 105:11	60:4 61:11,14,15	western 113:4,17
U.S 1:1		waste 8:20 9:4,10	61:17,21,21 62:11	114:17
	W	12:5 17:19 25:22	65:2 66:6 67:4,8	we'll 3:4 47:9 48:11
V	wages 74:22	71:19 73:6 77:2	67:19 68:2,7,15	we're 20:10 28:5,9
V 48:19,19	waging 70:8	90:6 105:9 112:17	69:2,6,6,7,12,18	30:3,8 33:9 35:8
vague 122:17	wait 97:20	112:22 119:1,14	71:17 73:6,13	37:9 42:6 48:17
Val 50:9	waiting 55:6	wasteful 29:8	74:14 76:9,21 77:4	71:1 73:5 75:5
value 110:16	WAND 30:21 31:5	wastes 8:18 9:2	77:16 78:4,18,19	90:13 92:12 103:3
values 34:19 64:9	31:17 33:1 95:13	wasting 65:13	79:10,16 80:13	104:16 120:10
119:12	95:18 96:5,9 99:21	watch 134:22	81:18 82:5 83:17	123:16,17 128:3
various 52:14 58:14	99:22	water 18:2 59:18	85:4,6 86:8 87:13	132:8
104:12 115:7	want 7:17 12:17	97:11,12,14 106:7	87:20 88:4,13,15	we've 4:8 18:4 20:8
vast 57:19	20:10 25:17 28:11	106:16,19 113:19	89:6,14 90:6,8	50:10
Vatican 127:9,15	35:9 46:4 47:19	watershed 105:22	92:2 94:3,7,12	White 63:19 105:10
Vegas 11:14 12:19	48:9 56:22 71:5	106:2	95:1,16,17 96:6,7	105:10
vehicles 9:13	72:17 90:14 91:1	watersheds 106:4	96:16,20 99:8,11	wide 91:8
Ventura 2:16 75:17	92:13 93:1,2 94:1	way 6:17 32:7 39:9	99:13 100:2 101:4	widely 9:9 52:5
79:4,6,7	99:14 104:3	43:14 48:9 82:20	101:20 102:14	widespread 117:7
verbatim 5:5	106:20 108:21	101:5 107:15	107:22 108:1,11	117:15
verse 6:4	113:13 121:8	125:18 129:10	108:12,21 110:2	wife 79:8
viability 128:5	133:21,22	ways 41:16 68:6	111:2,4,14,20,21	Wildlife 72:18
vice 130:15	wanted 49:13 96:14	104:6 121:12	113:21 114:9	William 26:11
vicinity 60:22	107:8 109:4 114:8	124:7	115:22 116:14	40:17
video 4:15 5:13	120:22 121:16	weapon 20:9 27:22	117:21 118:19	winning 49:22
view 6:9 26:22 39:9	wanting 124:18,19	34:13,20 54:2,19	119:3,6,11,21	winter 117:4
44:7,11 53:5 56:5	war 11:21 17:21	78:17 107:18	122:3,5 123:13	wiped 110:13
73:20 122:16	21:19 23:12,13	weaponry 82:18	124:7 125:12	Wisconsin 42:14
views 5:4,19 23:17	40:5 50:16 63:16	weapons 3:10 4:5	127:3,13 128:17	43:4 44:16
villages 70:14	64:7,15 70:9 82:4	7:13,22 9:6,11,17	128:21,22 130:7	wish 5:9 38:2
vintage 23:13	82:12 85:9,16,18	10:1,16 11:22 16:4	131:4,11 132:15	wished 64:3
violation 43:14 45:9	87:6 94:5 95:15	16:6 18:9 21:5	132:20,22 133:13	witness 82:10
vision 36:10 124:13	110:21 117:13,18	25:20 26:8,16,19	134:5	women 2:3 10:2
126:3 134:4,13,16	130:17,19	27:7,8,16,19 28:2	weapon's 9:12	30:22 38:4,6 41:12
134:17,18,18	warfare 87:12	28:3,14,16 29:1	39:19	129:1
Visji 2:18 81:12	warhead 34:3 35:2	30:10 31:8,16 32:5	weary 59:7	women's 1:15,18,19
84:18,19	35:22 43:20 54:13	32:9,15,18 33:19	week 130:14	6:22 9:19 30:21
voice 43:7 66:22	83:13 115:4,5	34:4,12,18 35:6,7	weigh 29:12 48:2	31:2,14,17 95:11
96:15	warheads 31:9	36:7 37:13,13	welcome 3:5 4:15	95:13,19
voices 49:10,10,11	38:14,18 39:5	38:21 39:1,14 40:8	21:6 51:10	words 17:11 20:5
Volume 26:22	62:10 68:4,12	40:12 41:2,11 42:2	wells 70:16 97:13	28:20 52:18,18
vomit 73:14	77:10 101:18	42:8,12,22 43:2,8	well-being 18:5	110:22
vote 80:19	116:21 117:2,2	43:9,17,19,21 44:1	went 58:14 84:1,2	work 7:2 14:7 15:22
voted 80:18	warned 71:16	45:12,16 46:6,9,11	102:8 113:12	46:15 47:4 49:14
voter 132:11	wars 9:18 86:8	46:11,19,22 47:5	weren't 94:9	50:14 68:19 70:15
voters 80:18	wash 105:13,14	49:4 51:17 53:9,16	Wertz 2:19 50:21	73:2 80:22 83:21

84:2,4 85:5 93:7 100:6 103:11 112:17 113:20 133:20 worked 17:15 47:17 71:9 79:10 104:10 118:6 workers 13:22 14:7 23:20 24:1 61:5 74:19 93:9 95:2 workforce 59:3 working 32:5 48:13 49:18 50:10 64:4 65:19,20 66:20 78:14 90:5 100:19 works 42:7 51:7 84:22 98:12 world 7:12 8:4 11:21 23:5,13 25:1 26:8 31:21 32:1,5 39:9,19 40:6 41:11 42:8 49:7 64:4,8 65:10,20 66:6,21 68:17 70:7 73:19 74:14 75:2,9 87:16 100:20 110:3,12 110:19 111:5 113:19 114:9 117:18,21 125:19 126:20 129:1 130:7 132:14 134:4 worldwide 46:7 65:13,13 world's 86:4 worst 17:13 57:11 worthied 41:18 wouldn't 111:13 wounded 63:15 64:2 writing 64:17 written 6:4 11:11 63:7 66:14 79:1 128:20 134:2 wrong 102:9 117:22 wrote 114:18 wrought 85:3 Wyka 1:14 4:19,20	5:6 6:14 121:1 Wyka's 5:2 <hr/> X <hr/> X'ed 63:21 <hr/> Y <hr/> yards 47:21 year 13:6 15:1 24:11,12 38:14,18 40:3,11 44:8 53:2 63:11,12,20 81:10 91:12 94:14 97:17 99:7 106:17 132:17,18,19 years 16:17 21:12 29:3 30:8,9 45:13 52:20,20 53:11,15 60:17 61:3 65:10 71:8 84:3 86:17 90:5 94:3 95:13 96:4 100:18 102:1 127:4 128:4 129:4 130:3 York 2:19 56:12,13 56:19 57:3,6,10 59:12 60:2 61:7 62:6,16 Yorkers 61:13 Yorker's 59:6 young 2:20 115:9 133:19,20 Yucca 113:1,22 Y-12 55:21 <hr/> Z <hr/> Zaebst 2:21,22 112:10 118:4,8 120:8,13 zero 26:19 38:12 <hr/> \$ <hr/> \$1 65:8 \$110 65:5 \$12 129:19 \$144 129:19 \$150 58:9,12 62:8 65:3,7 128:4	\$17.6 99:7,10 \$170 29:22 30:3 \$190 60:18 \$200 30:4 \$300 94:15 \$500 91:22 \$60 127:22 \$7 15:20 <hr/> 0 <hr/> 09 94:14 <hr/> 1 <hr/> 1E245 1:10 1,000 18:13 10 19:11 91:12 10,000 98:21,21 100 18:11 20:2 29:3 61:4 100,000 100:7 1000 1:10 11 24:11 11:59 3:2 115 63:13 12 129:20 12,000 100:15,16 12:00 1:11 13 10:14 56:20 14 83:7 88:8 142 128:10 15 20:8 36:20 107:17 150 31:11 60:17 150,000 98:22 16 33:10 42:10 16th 63:11 175 19:19 31:11 1945 64:16 1949 107:5,17,19 1950s 11:22 1957 56:14 1960s 60:5 1963 17:12 1970s 85:4 1980s 31:16 1983 40:5 1984 60:12 1986 82:3	1989 24:12 1991 31:19 1993 8:12 132:10 1995 53:11,15 1996 91:3 127:21 1999 8:12 <hr/> 2 <hr/> 2 80:15 2.2.2 15:3 2:00 50:7 20 4:18 16:17 60:17 61:5 90:5 115:3 127:3 20th 48:7 200 38:14 2000 105:7 2001 44:7 52:11,21 2003 19:4 2005 32:12 59:16 82:14 127:16 2006 38:9 2007 38:11 59:19 61:3 112:17 2008 1:7 32:4 38:15 44:9 2009 28:9 2010 52:21 2020 53:15 2030 7:6 30:5 31:12 38:11,19 40:21 51:18 53:2 65:8,11 66:3 97:15 2060 30:8 21st 48:8 128:18 23 61:3 235 19:20 24 57:14 25 1:7 53:15 25th 40:3 26 95:13 96:4 28 94:3 29 107:18 <hr/> 3 <hr/> 3:00 135:1 3:01 135:6 30 16:17 127:3	32 57:7 32,000 17:19 35 21:11 90:4 35,000 36:5 35-member 76:12 350 128:12 385 19:18 <hr/> 4 <hr/> 4 80:16 4,500 13:21 4.5 14:4 40 29:16 115:21 40s 71:18 <hr/> 5 <hr/> 50 18:10 30:8,9 31:3 100:18 117:2 50,000 92:11 500 80:16 106:17 588 19:20 <hr/> 6 <hr/> 6 78:15 86:12 87:4 102:20 60 29:16 63:20 80:21 81:1 60th 82:15 60,000 38:7 600 50:13 94:5 62 43:8 650 128:11 <hr/> 7 <hr/> 7th 114:10 7,000 121:6 70 71:8 101:22 70s 60:6 74,000 17:18 <hr/> 8 <hr/> 8,000 18:16 80 38:18 80s 114:22 800 18:15 <hr/> 9 <hr/> 9.7 19:18
--	--	---	--	---

9/11 68:5
90 90:17
90's 47:18
96 91:20
97 11:2