

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

COMPLEX TRANSFORMATION
DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMMATIC
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (SPEIS)
PUBLIC HEARING, PUBLIC COMMENT PORTION

March 27, 2008

6:36 p.m.

Misión y Convento

Plaza de Española

1 Calle de las Españolas

Española, New Mexico

Reported by: Sally Peters

(6472A) SP

1 MR. LARSON: Okay. I think we are about
2 ready to get started. I think we have got all the
3 technical machinery in operation, at least we will
4 find out if we have in a minute.

5 Good evening. Thank you all for taking
6 time to participate in this important public meeting
7 on the National Nuclear Security Administration's
8 Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Impact
9 Statement or Supplemental PEIS for the transformation
10 of the nation's nuclear weapons complex. I hope you
11 had an opportunity to browse the displays and talk to
12 project staff during the just completed open house.
13 If not, hopefully there will be some other
14 opportunities before you leave.

15 My name is Barry Larson. I am the neutral
16 moderator for this hearing. My role this evening is
17 to ensure that there are opportunities for those of
18 you participating to obtain information about the
19 proposed program and to provide your comments to the
20 department, and also to make sure that everyone
21 follows some very basic ground rules intended to
22 provide for fair and respectful participation by all
23 of us.

24 As you signed in at the registration table,
25 you should have received a participant's packet which

1 contains information on the transformation of the
2 nuclear weapons complex. There are two parts to this
3 hearing. The informal segment began with the open
4 house and continues after my remarks with a brief
5 welcome video from Mr. Robert Smolen, who is the
6 deputy administrator for defense programs. Then
7 there is a 20 minute presentation by Ted Wyka, the
8 Supplemental PEIS document manager. Mr. Wyka will
9 discuss the complex transformation project and the
10 contents of the Supplemental PEIS.

11 The formal segment of the hearing will
12 begin following his presentation, and during the
13 formal segment, members of the public -- that would
14 be you -- will be called to make oral comments on the
15 Supplemental EIS. The court reporter will then begin
16 making a verbatim record of your comments. There
17 will be no exchange of questions and answers. NNSA
18 officials will be here to listen to your comments but
19 will not be engaging in dialogue.

20 If you wish to make an oral comment during
21 the formal comment segment, you will need to have
22 signed up at the registration table, if you haven't
23 already. I will be recognizing speakers, as their
24 names appear on a registration list that will be
25 provided to me at the beginning of that formal

1 segment.

2 The ground rules for speakers give
3 additional information on providing your comments.
4 In the formal session, you will be allotted a maximum
5 of three minutes each to make your comments. I urge
6 you to make your comments concise and to the point of
7 the content of the PEIS. Now, if you have a longer
8 written statement, please summarize your comments
9 orally and submit the written document in its
10 entirety. If you believe that you will need more
11 than the allotted time, let me know, and if time
12 remains before the published end of the meeting,
13 which is 10:00, I will be pleased to provide you with
14 additional time after everyone else has had his or
15 her initial opportunity to speak.

16 I know a number of people have come some
17 distance, and I don't want to hold them up any longer
18 than possible, because they have to drive home this
19 evening afterwards. But we will be here to take your
20 comments until we have covered everybody.

21 That's it for the agenda and the hearing
22 format. Are there any questions about how we are to
23 proceed? Great, thank you, and thank you for your
24 cooperation in making this a productive and
25 respectful hearing, and I look forward to your

1 participation.

2 Now for the eight minute video to be
3 followed by Mr. Wyka's presentation.

4 (A short video of welcoming remarks by
5 Deputy Administrator Robert Smolen was presented.)

6 MR. LARSON: Before we go on to Mr. Wyka, a
7 comment that I would like to make before we go
8 further, and then an introduction to make, I have
9 done a lot of DOE meetings, and I think this is the
10 first one that we have had in Española. I would just
11 like to say it is wonderful that we are here, and I
12 can just tell you the whole staff is very impressed
13 by the venue here. It's really very nice, and you
14 should be proud of that.

15 Before we go further, the Mayor of
16 Española, Joseph Maestas is here and would like to
17 give a greeting. I know he has some comments for
18 later on, but he would like to give a greeting first.

19 Mayor.

20 MAYOR JOSEPH MAESTAS: Can you hear me back
21 there? On behalf of the entire City of Española and
22 the governing body of the City of Española, I want to
23 welcome you here tonight to this very important
24 public hearing. This is what our democracy is all
25 about, to weigh in on major issues facing us today

1 and tomorrow. I want to thank the Department of
2 Energy, the National Nuclear Security Administration,
3 Congressman Tom Udall, and Senator Jeff Bingaman for
4 assisting me in urging the additional supplemental
5 public hearing be held in Española. The original set
6 of public hearings did not include this city, and as
7 many of you know, my constituents comprise a
8 significant portion of the LANL workforce.

9 Again, I am very proud to have been a part
10 of this effort, and I know some of you were very
11 involved in pushing for this supplemental hearing. I
12 thank you for that, and most of all, I thank you for
13 being here and participating. I have members of my
14 governing body who are also very concerned about that
15 issue. I can't really see. Can you raise your
16 hands? We have some councilors. We have Councilor
17 Alfred Herrera, Councilor Eddie Maestas, Councilor
18 Danielle Durán, Councilor Cecelia Lujan. Did I miss
19 anyone else?

20 Thank you for being here and showing your
21 leadership on behalf of our constituents.

22 And again, please, this is your part, your
23 time to weigh in on this very important subject.
24 Thank you again, and welcome to our beautiful Misión
25 y Convento.

1 MR. LARSON: Thank you very much. We will
2 now have the presentation -- was it something that I
3 did?

4 MR. WYKA: I think I walked in front of the
5 mike.

6 MR. LARSON: We will now have a 20 minute
7 presentation by Mr. Wyka, and following that, we will
8 go right into our formal segment.

9 (A slide presentation was moderated by Ted
10 Wyka.)

11 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Wyka.

12 I have to read some things into the record,
13 if you will just bear with me for a minute or two,
14 and let me get that in officially, and then we will
15 start in.

16 This portion of our hearing is officially
17 designated as the, Española New Mexico Public Hearing
18 for the National Nuclear Security Administration's
19 Supplemental PEIS for the Complex Transformation
20 Program. This hearing is being held on March 27th in
21 the San Gabrielle Misión y Convento. It is being
22 held to receive comments on the content of this
23 Supplemental PEIS.

24 We are commencing the public comment period
25 portion of this hearing at approximately 7:15 p.m.

1 and are scheduled to adjourn once all participants
2 have had a chance to make their comments. Each
3 speaker will have a maximum of three minutes. We
4 will begin with elected officials. This hearing was
5 preceded by a presentation by NNSA's PEIS document
6 manager, Mr. Ted Wyka. Mr. Wyka will represent the
7 NNSA here in listening to and accepting your
8 comments.

9 For the record, once again my name is Barry
10 Larson. I have been asked by NNSA to conduct this
11 comment period as an independent and neutral
12 moderator. I will ensure that the ground rules that
13 we reviewed earlier in the evening are followed. The
14 court reporter tonight is Sally Peters. Ms. Peters'
15 task is to create a complete and accurate transcript
16 of this hearing. A verbatim transcript of oral
17 comments received tonight will be included in the
18 NNSA's record of these proceedings. The
19 administration will place copies of the transcript
20 from this and other public hearings in the Freedom of
21 Information Act designated reading rooms as soon as
22 practicable.

23 If you wish to make comments tonight, you
24 must have first signed up at the registration table.
25 I will recognize speakers in the order in which they

1 have registered. Please remain in the room if you
2 are scheduled to speak. I will be calling three
3 speakers at a time, the current and the next two, so
4 that you will have some warning before you are to
5 speak. Please move toward the front of the room when
6 you are called to be on deck. That will give just
7 that much more time for testimony. We have left a
8 couple of seats open right in the front here, so if
9 you hear your name and you are going to be on deck,
10 if you will move up to the front, that will save all
11 of us time.

12 When it's your turn to speak, please come
13 forward to this podium that Mr. Wyka used earlier.
14 If you are approaching the time limit allowed, which
15 is three minutes, I will give you a signal basically
16 telling you you have 30 seconds remaining, and ask
17 you to summarize your remaining comments as quickly
18 and as gracefully as possible. I may call for a
19 break or a recess in the proceedings to give the
20 court reporter and others a breather.

21 Now let's do a little math. As of this
22 point, I have 70 people who have signed up to speak.
23 If we give three minutes, and we can stay the three
24 minutes for each person, that's 210 minutes. That is
25 three and a half hours. That gets us well beyond the

1 10:00 hour and approaching 11:00. So, again, on our
2 behalf, as well as the people who are 65th through
3 69th, on their behalf, to have you stay to those
4 three minutes, if you would please.

5 If you have conversations that you need to
6 have, I would ask you to take them outside of the
7 room to help and to not make it confusing for the
8 court reporter. And if you just take a moment to
9 shut off any cell phones that you may have, that
10 would be appreciated.

11 Speakers are recommended to state your name
12 for the court reporter's record. If you have a
13 written copy of your comments or if you have a
14 written document that you would like to submit,
15 please bring it to me after you have spoken. Written
16 materials will be formally accepted into the record
17 as comments to this hearing in addition to oral
18 comments. Very importantly, you should recognize
19 that each, both oral and written comments, are
20 weighed equally by NNSA.

21 Finally, remember you may submit comments
22 after this evening, even if you have done so already
23 by up to April 10th, and there is no limitation on
24 the number or the length of comments an individual
25 may submit.

1 All right. Thank you for your patience,
2 and let's move ahead. The first person that's on my
3 list tonight is Pablo Sedillo, to be followed by
4 Jeanette Wallace and Jon Goldstein.

5 Mr. Sedillo.

6 MR. PABLO SEDILLO: Thank you, Barry.

7 My name is Pablo Sedillo and I am here
8 representing Senator Jeff Bingaman, and the senator
9 has asked me to read the following statement.

10 "Good evening. I am very pleased to be
11 able to send this message to all of you attending the
12 meeting on the transformation of the country's
13 nuclear weapons complex. I would first like to thank
14 the DOE for adding this hearing to its schedule. I,
15 along with many of my fellow New Mexicans, asked the
16 DOE to add Española to the schedule, because the
17 community is greatly affected by what happens at the
18 laboratory in Los Alamos. So many of you work here,
19 and the fortunes of Española and all of northern New
20 Mexico are intertwined within the future of the
21 laboratory. It is extremely important to me that you
22 are allowed to express your concerns and opinions
23 regarding the future of LANL at the location that is
24 convenient to residents with an interest in the
25 outcome.

1 "For the same reason, I contacted Tom
2 D'Agostino, the administrator of the National Nuclear
3 Security Administration, and asked him to extend the
4 deadline for written comment by 90 days to July 2008.
5 I sincerely believe that more time is needed for the
6 public to thoroughly review the changes described in
7 the Complex Transformation SPEIS. Your written
8 comments will be given the same consideration as
9 comments you make here this evening. Thank you for
10 being here and showing your concern for our great
11 State of New Mexico.

12 "Senator Jeff Bingaman."

13 MR. LARSON: Thank you, sir. Our next
14 speaker will be Jeannette Wallace followed by Jon
15 Goldstein and Sylvia Vergara.

16 REPRESENTATIVE JEANNETTE WALLACE: I do
17 thank all of you for holding these public forums all
18 over our state, and I thank the audience for being
19 interested enough to come.

20 My name is Jeannette Wallace. I am a state
21 representative in New Mexico. My district includes
22 Los Alamos, Sandoval, and Santa Fe. However, many of
23 you out there know me because I am a strong supporter
24 and a friend of northern New Mexico.

25 Los Alamos National Lab and Sandia National

1 Lab are both important to our state and our nation,
2 as well as our region. We do provide well-paying
3 jobs to many in northern New Mexico. We work with
4 the schools of northern New Mexico to work to educate
5 all of our children so they can lead a successful
6 life.

7 Los Alamos National Lab has great
8 technological capabilities. We can reduce the
9 nuclear operations footprint by nearly 50 percent.
10 We can reduce the stockpile while enhancing security
11 and readiness. And let us never forget, that
12 national security and readiness is important to our
13 citizens of this country. We can use our technology
14 and computer modeling to verify without underground
15 testing. We can be more cost effective and downsize.
16 At the same time, we will always remember national
17 security is important.

18 We have great scientists at Los Alamos with
19 a great many disciplines. The issues they work on
20 include a broad range of projects. These projects
21 include many spin-offs that take place as a result of
22 something that excites a scientist during a project
23 he is working on. They include valuable health care,
24 research, energy security, environmental issues,
25 including key climate change issues, technology to

1 find solutions to complex math, science, and physics
2 problems. These advances have been made possible
3 with LANL technology and scientific work, much of it
4 derived from the national defense and national
5 security work.

6 We urge you to listen to those who are
7 supporting the lab. We urge you to try to figure out
8 how we can move forward on this. Thank you.

9 MR. LARSON: Thank you very much.

10 Our next speaker this evening is Jon
11 Goldstein to be followed by Sylvia Vergara and Joseph
12 Maestas.

13 MR. JON GOLDSTEIN: Can you guys hear in
14 the back? Can you guys hear? Great.

15 My name is Jon Goldstein. I am the Deputy
16 Secretary of the New Mexico Environment Department.
17 Secretary Ron Curry asked me to be here tonight to
18 read the statement from him. These are the New
19 Mexico Environment Department's formal comments on
20 this proposal, and I will read them to you now. He
21 sends his regrets that he was not able to be here.

22 "The New Mexico Environment Department
23 submits the following comments on the Draft Complex
24 Transformation Supplemental Programmatic
25 Environmental Impact Statement: NMED understands

1 that this SPEIS analyzes the potential environmental
2 impacts of numerous alternatives to 'continue
3 transformation of the nuclear weapons complex to be
4 smaller and more responsive, efficient, and secure in
5 order to meet national security requirements.'

6 "While these goals may be laudable in
7 general terms, it is in the details to the plans for
8 Los Alamos National Laboratory that NMED objects.
9 Currently LANL maintains production capability for
10 limited quantities of plutonium components, i.e.
11 pits, for delivery to the stockpile. The SPEIS
12 states that one of the perceived needs for action is
13 to provide adequate production capability for a
14 presumed smaller stockpile and assumes the need to
15 develop a manufacturing capacity to produce anywhere
16 from 50 to 125 new weapons annually. NMED supports
17 the No Action Alternative with respect to pit
18 production at LANL.

19 "Otherwise, NMED supports any alternative
20 that consolidates the complex, including LANL, to be
21 more efficient and to generate less hazardous and
22 radioactive waste. However, any cost savings
23 realized through this consolidation, must be used to
24 fully fund LANL's clean-up obligations to the state.

25 "At a time when the federal government is

1 coming up short on needed clean-up funding at LANL
2 and other Department of Energy sites, DOE should not
3 even consider increased pit production. DOE has a
4 long history in New Mexico of paying lip service to
5 clean-up, manifested in budget shortfalls and
6 environmental management year after year. This is
7 precisely why NMED put a state-enforceable,
8 fence-to-fence clean-up order in place in 2005. DOE
9 and its contractors signed the order, signifying
10 their pledge to all New Mexicans that they are
11 finally serious about clean-up.

12 "Unfortunately in the last three years
13 since the parties entered into this historic order,
14 the DOE and the laboratory have missed several
15 milestones and failed to substantively comply with
16 the technical requirements on several others."

17 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds.

18 MR. GOLDSTEIN: "NMED recognizes that
19 insufficient budget is an important factor in driving
20 further noncompliance. It is, however, by no means
21 the only factor. As disagreements over technical
22 approach, inadequate project oversight, management
23 breakdowns, and mistakes in execution have emerged as
24 important factors.

25 "Each year New Mexicans see the LANL budget

1 increase. Each year the clean-up budget falls
2 further and further short of what is needed to
3 conduct the work. Before it looks at expanding
4 existing emissions, the federal government must meet
5 and fund its clean-up commitments to the people of
6 New Mexico. It is unconscionable that the DOE and
7 its contractors at LANL are even considering funding
8 additional pit production, while at the same time
9 refusing to put the required funding towards
10 clean-up. They cannot expect the citizens of New
11 Mexico to continue to potentially be exposed to new
12 pollution when their 60 year legacy of contamination
13 remains unaddressed.

14 "NMED and the State of New Mexico are
15 gravely concerned that increased pit production at
16 LANL will only further divert needed funding and
17 management attention from these crucial clean-up
18 activities. For this reason, we strongly oppose any
19 increases in pit production capability or any
20 expansion of LANL's mission in general. Addressing
21 and correcting LANL's legacy of pollution should be
22 job number one for the lab. It is the lab's legal
23 and moral responsibility to implement the historic
24 2005 fence-to-fence clean-up order quickly and
25 completely.

1 "Sincerely, Ron Curry, Secretary of New
2 Mexico Environment Department."

3 MR. LARSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
4 is Sylvia Vergara to be followed by Joseph Maestas
5 and Danielle Durán.

6 MS. SYLVIA VERGARA: My name is Sylvia
7 Vergara. I have two very, very precious gifts here
8 that are worth more than the billions of dollars that
9 are put into weapons, and that is water. We have
10 water here from the Rio Grande graciously given by
11 Sherry Kotowski. And terra, earth. We cannot
12 contaminate our water and our earth. And I am
13 against plutonium production on the planet, not just
14 at Los Alamos.

15 About one percent of our drinking water on
16 our planet is drinkable, is usable. How can we use
17 our water to produce plutonium? I was interviewed by
18 Natalia Miranova, Russia's environmentalist, and her
19 question to me was, can our two countries work
20 together to produce a safer, healthier, cleaner
21 environment, and I told her yes. She is helping to
22 take people who have been contaminated from the Mayak
23 plutonium facility. They are having to relocate
24 them. Half a million people have been exposed to
25 radiation there. And the Mayak facility is still in

1 production, and it has completely ruined their river,
2 and we have a river.

3 I never thought we would have to relocate,
4 but after talking to her I thought about it. It's
5 also ruined many, many of their lakes, and the
6 contamination is now heading towards the waters of
7 the arctic. We need our scientists all over the
8 world to join together to clean up our planet. We
9 have contamination on our planet, and we have 2,000
10 wonderful gifted scientists in Los Alamos who could
11 probably figure out how to do this.

12 We should have 2,000 people in addition who
13 are experts in negotiation. Peace is about
14 negotiating, it is about talk, and talk is cheap. It
15 doesn't cost the billions of dollars to make the
16 weapons. Well, I gave Natalia a poem, and I want to
17 read it to you, because it's about the Rio Grande
18 becoming so pure that we could drink its waters, and
19 that's how our drinking water around the world should
20 be.

21 This is my gift to her:

22 In my dreams, my wishing sees myself cup my
23 hands and drinking, purest waters from the Rio
24 Grande, just as my ancestors did.

25 My hands are filled with this dream within

1 beautiful dreams, and I know that when the world can
2 drink like this from its rivers, that we will be safe
3 and blessed by the earth. This is the great
4 benediction.

5 I also want to urge you to go to this
6 website. It's very, very important, okay. It's
7 called --

8 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds.

9 MS. VERGARA: It's called
10 [whistleblower.org/doc/R/russianpercent20nuclearpercen](http://whistleblower.org/doc/R/russianpercent20nuclearpercent20danger.pdf)
11 [t20danger.pdf](http://whistleblower.org/doc/R/russianpercent20nuclearpercent20danger.pdf), and you will see a plutonium facility
12 that they cannot clean it up. Okay. She is telling
13 us, you know, that we have to do more change, deeper
14 human change okay. We cannot be following that road
15 down that way. Okay, thank you.

16 MR. LARSON: Our next speaker is Joseph
17 Maestas to be followed by Danielle Durán and Carol
18 Miller.

19 MAYOR JOSEPH MAESTAS: Good evening. My
20 name is Joseph Maestas. I am the mayor of the City
21 of Española. My remarks tonight are those of myself
22 only. This does not reflect in any way official city
23 policy.

24 But tonight, in the context of this public
25 hearing, I offer all of you a new post carbon, post

1 nuclear paradigm for energy independence. I commend
2 the National Nuclear Security Administration for this
3 effort to be more responsive to our national security
4 needs by reducing our nation's nuclear footprint and
5 saving limited federal funds by eliminating
6 redundancies in missions, capabilities, and
7 facilities. However, the Cold War paradigm that has
8 existed and continues with this proposed complex
9 transformation is obsolete.

10 A capability-based deterrent to maintain a
11 firm nuclear posture to address perceived threats
12 from other superpowers, such as China and Russia, is
13 no longer visionary. If the United States is to be a
14 credible world leader, it must practice what it
15 preaches. If US diplomacy towards other superpowers
16 and developing countries expects them not to build
17 more nuclear weapons, then our own nuclear weapons
18 policy should be consistent with that expectation.

19 Ensuring the safety and security of our
20 nation's existing nuclear stockpiles is paramount.
21 We must prudently reduce and dismantle these
22 stockpiles. We are a country at war, but at what
23 cost? Our economy is in distress. Our domestic
24 needs are growing. Our dependence on foreign oil is
25 limiting our global economic potential and imperiling

1 our environment. Will we, through this proposed EIS,
2 be establishing this region as a nuclear target and
3 create additional environmental problems?

4 We are truly at a tipping point, my fellow
5 citizens. We may incrementally continue this old
6 Cold War mentality, or boldly move forward by
7 applying the best science in the world, with help
8 from our federal energy facilities, for new peaceful
9 initiatives that will lead us towards energy
10 independence.

11 As mayor of the City of Española, I am
12 extremely sensitive of the impact on existing
13 programs at LANL as they do represent high wage jobs
14 for my constituents. However, a mission change for
15 LANL that is funded and planned properly without
16 additional job losses is possible and long overdue.

17 It can't happen overnight, but it must
18 happen nevertheless. We already have begun a true
19 transformation right here in Española. We have
20 secured funding and lodged a bold initiative to
21 establish a solar energy research park and academy in
22 Northern New Mexico College. We have established the
23 Renewable Energy Development and Deployment
24 Institution that will develop and commercialize
25 market-ready products and solutions, primarily energy

1 storage and distribution technologies. These efforts
2 potentially place Española and northern New Mexico at
3 the forefront of renewable energy, research,
4 education and deployment. This region can be the
5 global center of excellence for the new energy
6 economy. New, sustainable, recession proof green
7 collar jobs can be created.

8 In closing I want to ask you to imagine the
9 brightest minds at LANL and other federal science
10 labs rapidly commercializing resulting technologies.
11 Imagine American, once again a formidable competitor
12 in a global economy and a country responsibly meeting
13 its domestic environmental and national security
14 needs. Imagine an America no longer dependent on
15 foreign oil. I am issuing a call to action to get
16 involved and weigh in on the future of our nuclear
17 weapons policy. We all share responsibility to
18 question old paradigms and create new approaches that
19 will lead humanity with hope to a peaceful future.
20 Only by joining our hearts and minds will we make it
21 a reality. Imagine.

22 Thank you very much.

23 MR. LARSON: Thank you.

24 Our next speaker is Daniel Durán, then Carl
25 Miller, and Sylvia Lujan.

1 MS. DANIEL DURÁN: Good evening. I really
2 hate following Mayor Maestas after that rousing
3 speech.

4 Tonight I have two documents to provide to
5 the formal statement on the PEIS. One of them is a
6 resolution passed by the City of Española, and
7 another is a letter from myself and another councilor
8 regarding our request to Los Alamos National
9 Laboratory, NNSA, and DOE.

10 The first item is the resolution that we
11 passed, Resolution 2007-62, which supports
12 maintaining funding at Los Alamos National
13 Laboratory. As many of you know, northern New Mexico
14 and especially the city of Española and Española
15 Valley, the people who live here are very dependent
16 on continuing the budget funding for Los Alamos
17 National Laboratory. The mayor spoke about
18 mitigating further job losses at Los Alamos National
19 Laboratory, and this resolution does not speak to how
20 that happens, but we do need the lab to stay stable
21 for a certain amount of time, so that economic
22 development can take place here in the city and in
23 the valley to mitigate any further budget cuts at Los
24 Alamos National Laboratory.

25 The second item is a letter written by

1 myself and signed on to by Helen Kain-Salazar, from
2 our city council, which asks for NNSA and for DOE and
3 for the Los Alamos National Laboratory to create a
4 regularly scheduled reporting process with the City
5 of Española regarding environmental impacts from
6 increased plutonium production and from other
7 activities at Los Alamos National Laboratory.

8 This evening I was told by Los Alamos
9 National Laboratory officials that that request would
10 be granted, and we will start a regularly scheduled
11 reporting process. Additionally we have asked that
12 the City of Española's review of the environmental
13 impacts and the economic impacts from Los Alamos
14 National Laboratory be considered as part of the
15 LANS' annual review for its contract and bonus. So
16 we hope that our input and the city's input and the
17 people's input here from the City of Española would
18 continue to have an effect on Los Alamos National
19 Laboratory and the work that they do, and hopefully
20 to mitigate any environmental impacts and economic
21 impacts that they have on the City of Española and
22 northern New Mexico. Thank you.

23 MR. LARSON: Thank you.

24 MS. CAROL MILLER: Thank you very much.

25 MR. LARSON: Excuse me, Ms. Miller, just

1 one second. I have to introduce new speakers. In a
2 minute we will hear from Carol Miller to be followed
3 by Cecilia Lujan and Jay Coughlan.

4 MS. MILLER: Thank you very much. I don't
5 know how anyone else felt, but during that slide
6 show, I thought I was having an out of body
7 experience. It is unbelievable that we sit here and
8 see a mockery made of the National Environmental
9 Policy Act that pretends to take citizen input into
10 decision-making, when there is no option to shut it
11 down, to stop this insanity of the nuclear weapons
12 complex. You know, you would have thought we were
13 talking about a plant that was going to start
14 building photovoltaic cells or something. It was so
15 neutral, yet so horrible.

16 I am a public health worker who came to New
17 Mexico with a specialization in occupational and
18 environmental health, and one of the first jobs I was
19 offered was a study at LANL, to look at the effects
20 of plutonium on the workforce. And I said, I cannot
21 be a documenter of toxic exposures of human subjects.
22 It's just we have been part and party to a tremendous
23 and never-ending experiment on human subjects. That
24 is what the lab has really done.

25 And it's not just the lab. The map is

1 incomplete. I saw and we heard that maybe they are
2 going to move another thing to White Sands. White
3 Sands did not show up on the map. The uranium
4 enrichment facility that is also getting built in Lea
5 County did not show up on that map. WIPP did not
6 show up on that map. If you look at New Mexico and
7 the endless stream of nuclear facilities that are
8 created here, we need to look at the total impacts,
9 economic and health-wise on that.

10 And I have some prepared remarks, but I'm
11 going to ignore them to just tell you, from the
12 heart, I do a lot of grant writing here. I see other
13 grant writers here. If there has been such a great
14 economic impact from these facilities in the State of
15 New Mexico, why are we still on the bottom of so many
16 indicators? Why do we have one of the world's
17 highest child poverty rates including Rio Arriba
18 County, where so many people supposedly benefit
19 economically from the lab? Why do we have the kinds
20 of high school dropouts, the inadequately funded
21 schools, all of the social problems we know about?
22 Why does Rio Arriba County have the nation's highest
23 heroin overdose rate if there are so many benefits
24 that we get from having a weapons complex in our
25 midst?

1 They do not show up in the economic
2 indicators. You look at any county, with the
3 exception of Los Alamos County, and what you see in
4 census data: Higher poverty, lower median income,
5 lower family income, higher disability rates, and it
6 goes on and on and on.

7 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

8 MS. MILLER: I just want to say that I
9 cannot support any of the options that we are
10 supposed to choose between. That is an unacceptable
11 choice, and I think that the DOE needs to go back to
12 the drawing board and give the public an option that
13 actually addresses clean-up, as the mayor said, and
14 some of the other things.

15 And I'm going to end with a quote from a
16 surprising source, which is Dwight D. Eisenhower, and
17 it's not the one you think you know, but it says: "I
18 think that people want peace so much, that one of
19 these days the government had better get out of the
20 way and let them have it.

21 MR. LARSON: I thank you.

22 Our next speaker is Cecilia Lujan, then Jay
23 Coghlan and Mike Wheeler.

24 MS. CECILIA LUJAN: Good evening. My name
25 is Cecilia Lujan. I am a councilor for the City of

1 Española.

2 I support the NNSA preferred alternative
3 for Los Alamos National Laboratory to be the site for
4 plutonium research, development, and manufacturing,
5 as well as nuclear weapons design and engineering and
6 super computing for our nation. I also support the
7 alternative as a continued effort to our national
8 security against terrorism.

9 LANL has been and should continue to be a
10 major employer of northern New Mexico. LANL has also
11 been a great supporter of various educational
12 programs that benefit our citizens and our
13 communities. And I could go on and on, but I would
14 like to allot time to the various speakers. Thank
15 you very much.

16 MR. LARSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
17 is Jay Coghlan to be followed by Mike Wheeler and Jan
18 Van Prooyen.

19 MR. JAY COGHLAN: My name is Jay Coghlan.
20 I work for on outfit called Nuclear Watch New Mexico.
21 I did this in Santa Fe, but I'll take the opportunity
22 to again thank Ted Wyka. He is with NNSA, but he and
23 I conversed some. I was really concerned that the
24 reference ducts would be posted online, and Ted got
25 it done, Ted and his team. So this is really

1 valuable for the serious researcher and commentator,
2 which apparently I think I am.

3 But to get to the issues, first of all, for
4 those who are interested, there is a fact sheet that
5 we have produced, both front and back, salmon
6 colored, as you can see. It basically explicates why
7 pit production is just flat out not needed
8 whatsoever. And to summarize ever so briefly, there
9 are seven weapons types in the planned stockpile of
10 the future that will occur in about five years or so.
11 Six of the seven pit types, the Pantex plant outside
12 of Amarillo, is specifically authorized to quote
13 reuse 350 pits a year. And the plant itself boasts
14 how pit reuse is far cheaper, far less
15 environmentally damaging than virgin pit production.

16 Concerning the seventh type, DOE has always
17 argued that it needed to reestablish pit production
18 because Rocky Flats was so abruptly shut down after
19 the FBI raided it for environmental crimes, that
20 there weren't spare pits for annual checkups for
21 defects. Well, it's pretty well-known that only one
22 pit per weapon type is torn down annually each year,
23 but yet last year, Los Alamos produced ten of these
24 particular types of pits, and then immediately
25 shipped them off to the Pantex plant for assembly

1 into deployed weapons.

2 Where I am going with this is that
3 ultimately, this proposal to be able to produce 50 to
4 80 pits per year, it's not about the existing
5 weapons. It is about the so-called reliable
6 replacement warheads, the future weapons, the new
7 designs, that the weaponaires still want to design
8 and produce despite congressional rejection. That is
9 what this proposal is all about.

10 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

11 MR. COGHLAN: To those who support complex
12 transformation -- I have heard this at the Santa Fe
13 hearing -- I oversimplify it, but they do it largely
14 for money, for so-called economic development. They
15 need to consider that the opposite will occur. There
16 are numerous references that the laboratory itself
17 will be split up. Pit production will go to a
18 separate cooperate entity, all of Technical Area 55,
19 numerous references on that.

20 The remaining part of the laboratory will
21 probably be largely devoted to weapons research and
22 development. For a number of reasons it is arguable
23 that this is a hopefully dying industry. This is not
24 where to put the smart money for those who are
25 concerned about economic development here in the

1 Española Valley, and again, pit production could
2 block those prospects. So I will close there.

3 I write comprehensive written comments. I
4 would like to suggest that all of you all do the
5 same, and get them in by the 10th, unless NNSA
6 graciously extends the deadline, as Bingaman, Udall,
7 the mayor, and everybody else has asked for. So
8 thank you.

9 MR. LARSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
10 is Mike Wheeler. Mr. Wheeler will be followed by Jan
11 Van Prooyen, and then Marvin Vigil, and I think
12 Marvin Vigil and Yvonne Quintan together.

13 MR. MIKE WHEELER: Thank you. My name is
14 Mike Wheeler. I serve on the Los Alamos County
15 Council. Los Alamos formally endorsed the preferred
16 alternative, but I am here to speak on behalf of
17 myself tonight and do not represent the council here.

18 When the Berlin Wall fell in 1988, or
19 whenever that was, '89, I can assure you there was
20 nobody in this room who was happier about the end of
21 the Cold War than me. I spent many, many years
22 providing what I felt, and continue to believe, was a
23 definite absolute defense of this nation, and I
24 continue to believe that we have a stockpile that
25 needs to be reduced, and that will happen given a

1 change of administrations, but we also have to
2 maintain a capability, because there is always going
3 to be some bad guys that show up, and I always
4 believe that it's important to carry a big stick.

5 So I appreciate your time. I want to thank
6 Mayor Maestas for hosting this, and I want to thank
7 the NNSA for extending this meeting to Española.
8 Thank you.

9 MR. LARSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
10 is Jan Van Prooyen to be followed by Marvin Vigil,
11 Yvonne Quintan, and after them, Johnny Martinez.

12 MR. JAN VAN PROOYEN: Good evening. My
13 name is Jan Van Prooyen, and I am deputy director of
14 Los Alamos National Laboratory. I am a New Mexico
15 resident, and I live in Los Alamos County.

16 At the outset, let me state my belief, that
17 the preferred alternative is in the department's --
18 that is described in the department's Supplemental
19 Programmatic EIS is the best choice for our nation
20 and for our national security interests.

21 Let me take a minute and share with you my
22 background. My life work has centered on the
23 national security of this country. I have spent 30
24 years as an officer in the US Army. I retired in
25 1996 as a major general. My specialties were nuclear

1 weapons, ballistic missiles defense, and acquisition
2 of the major weapons system that our army uses today.
3 Twelve years ago I came into the private sector, and
4 in that 12 years I have worked continuously on
5 national security issues. I had direct
6 responsibility for four mega projects to eliminate
7 lethal chemical stockpiles in the United States.

8 I worked overseas in the former Soviet
9 Union to eliminate large numbers of ballistic
10 missiles and their silos and associated equipment.
11 Those missiles had been pointed at the United States,
12 and it gave me a great deal of pleasure to see them
13 gone. From all of these experiences, both in the
14 military and in the private sector, I have a lot of
15 firsthand knowledge of the critical and the central
16 role that our deterrent nuclear stockpile played in
17 protecting our nation and keeping our world in
18 harmony.

19 I also know that international
20 relationships can change very quickly, and that we
21 must always be ready to protect our vital interests.
22 I firmly believe that our military strength must
23 continue to include a small, responsive, and highly
24 reliable nuclear weapons deterrent capability.

25 Now, let me tell you specifically why I

1 believe that the preferred alternative should be
2 adopted. First, the department's proposed approach
3 is the most efficient, effective way of using
4 existing national resources. Second, there is no
5 question that the laboratory's expertise and
6 production handling and processing of nuclear and
7 non-nuclear materials makes it the best and most
8 logical site for future limited production involving
9 plutonium. This work simply cannot be done more
10 efficiently elsewhere.

11 Third, modernizing Los Alamos will reduce
12 the lab's footprint for nuclear operations by
13 50 percent. This will result in cost savings. It
14 will increase safety. It will allow reduced movement
15 of nuclear materials, and an enhanced ability to meet
16 evolving, unknown future nuclear national security
17 challenges.

18 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

19 MR. VAN PROOYEN: These important changes
20 are exactly what the preferred alternative proposes.
21 The alternative will protect our national security,
22 it will ensure the economic vitality of northern New
23 Mexico, and it will also ensure the vitality of our
24 laboratory and allow it to produce the technologies
25 that will protect our nation and improve the quality

1 of our life across the globe. Thank you.

2 MR. LARSON: Thank you, sir.

3 Our next speaker is Marvin Vigil, to be
4 followed by Yvonne Quintan and Johnnie Martinez.

5 MR. MARVIN VIGIL: Good evening. My name
6 is Marvin Vigil. I am a life-long member. I was
7 born and raised in the City of Española. I believe
8 that I live in one of the most beautiful valleys in
9 the entire world.

10 I am here to support the NNSA preferred
11 alternative for Los Alamos National Laboratory to be
12 the site for plutonium research, development, and
13 manufacturing, as well as nuclear weapons design and
14 engineering and super computing for our nation. I
15 support this primarily because I am from the Española
16 Valley. I was born and raised here, as I said. My
17 family works at LANL in various capacities. I have
18 worked for a subcontractor for LANL.

19 Currently I am not employed, but I believe
20 that the economic development of this valley, and
21 indeed northern New Mexico, is vital to Los Alamos
22 National Laboratory. I say that as a former planning
23 director and city manager for the City of Española.
24 Because of that, having been in that capacity, I am
25 able to see both sides of what happens up there.

1 I call on DOE, the NNSA, and LANL to ensure
2 that the preferred alternative is followed to the
3 end. I believe that this is necessary in order to
4 provide for jobs to be maintained in the Española
5 Valley and northern New Mexico, that basic services
6 are provided for us. Without Los Alamos National
7 Laboratory, I believe the economic development
8 viability of this portion of the state will, quite
9 frankly, die. We can't afford that.

10 Everyone here is here because they believe
11 this valley has something to provide in various
12 capacities. Some of you are under the belief that by
13 doing away with LANL, we might be doing a greater
14 justice to the world, but the world without the
15 people that are here is not a world, and the people
16 that live here need these jobs.

17 I call on DOE, LANL, and NNSA to please,
18 please do their best to clean-up the messes that they
19 have made in the fifties and sixties and seventies
20 and the eighties and the nineties, and, oh, my we are
21 at 50 years now. It is ridiculous. It needs to be
22 done, but LANL needs to be maintain its proper place,
23 not only in the state, but the nation and the world.
24 Again, I support the preferred alternative, I support
25 New Mexico, I support Española. Thank you.

1 MR. LARSON: The next speaker is Yvonne
2 Quintan and then Johnnie Martinez and Dave Clark.

3 MS. YVONNE QUINTAN: Ladies and gentlemen,
4 my name is Yvonne Quintan, and I support the NNSA
5 preferred alternative for Los Alamos National
6 Laboratory. There are some serious reasons why I
7 support that. It's not just economics. Economics
8 play a vital role in the survival of this community,
9 and it's very easy to say that it's all about money
10 to people that support this alternative. But that's
11 not all it's about. We live here, and without
12 economics, without addressing the economic impact
13 that will otherwise befall this community, you have
14 to realize that without the economic end of things
15 being addressed, we will wind up with a loss of jobs,
16 a loss of basic services, an impact on schools, an
17 impact on all of the things that we need to live in
18 this community.

19 I chose this community to start my
20 business, to continue my business, and to raise my
21 family. I did that for one reason, I believe it's a
22 beautiful place to reside, but it is dependent on
23 economic growth and economic stability. When there
24 is economic instability at Los Alamos National
25 Laboratory, the valley does feel it. Española Valley

1 is dramatically impacted.

2 Just over the course of the last year,
3 those individuals who have businesses, who are
4 engaged in the services that are provided in this
5 community can attest to the fact that this community
6 is dramatically impacted by any instability that is
7 felt up in Los Alamos National Laboratory. That
8 doesn't mean that we should not pursue these
9 endeavors in a fashion that promotes safety, that
10 promotes clean-up. Of course we want all of those
11 things. We should be able to have both.

12 This type of activity is going to happen.
13 We need to do it in a safe and productive fashion.
14 We need to be open to economic development. We need
15 to look at economic impact. We need to pursue
16 peaceful alternatives, yes, but not at the risk of
17 safety and security.

18 I support the preferred alternative for Los
19 Alamos National Laboratory, because I believe it's
20 best for this community in the long term. I think
21 that things need to be done in a safe manner. There
22 needs to be clean-up. There needs to be
23 accountability. But nonetheless, I think that that
24 can be accomplished by supporting this initiative.
25 Thank you.

1 MR. LARSON: Thank you. I would like to
2 call now on Johnnie Martinez, then Dave Clark and Bob
3 Putnam.

4 MR. JOHNNIE MARTINEZ: Good evening. My
5 name is Johnnie Martinez, and I am proud to say
6 northern New Mexico has been my home for 58 years. I
7 am also proud to say that the Los Alamos National
8 Laboratory has been my employer for 33 years. Norris
9 Bradbury, the second director of what was then known
10 as the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory once said,
11 "The whole object of making weapons is not to kill
12 people, but to find time for somebody to find other
13 ways to solve these problems."

14 That statement was made many years ago when
15 the planet was embroiled in what came to be known as
16 the Cold War, and nuclear weapons designed at Los
17 Alamos did indeed force the powers involved to
18 resolve their deep-seated differences by other means.
19 I believe that proof of this can be found in the
20 costly, but nonetheless limited scale, non-military
21 nuclear conflicts that have occurred since 1945, the
22 year the two nuclear weapons showed the world the
23 terrible consequences of their deployment.

24 Today nuclear weapons designed and
25 maintained by Los Alamos National Laboratory continue

1 to provide the time we seem to need to solve our
2 differences by other means. As a laboratory employer
3 for 33 years, I have become confident and I remain
4 confident that the people and resources of this
5 laboratory can meet our nation's security needs
6 safely, securely, and conscientiously. I firmly
7 believe that the new responsibilities proposed for
8 the laboratory by the National Nuclear Security
9 Administration will enable the laboratory to build
10 upon its science and technology strengths to further
11 increase its effectiveness in support of this
12 security mission.

13 For 65 years we have repeatedly renewed and
14 redirected our resources there to meet changing
15 national security needs and we can do so again. As a
16 father and grandfather, I also remain hopeful that
17 the protection afforded by nuclear weapons will
18 continue to force us, and the policy makers who
19 represent us, to find other ways to solve those
20 problems. Thank you.

21 MR. LARSON: Thank you.

22 I would like to call now for Dave Clark,
23 then Bob Putnam and Sasha Pyle.

24 MR. DAVID CLARK: Can you hear me in the
25 back? Okay.

1 My name is David Clark, and I am a Los
2 Alamos National Laboratory fellow. I represent a new
3 generation of scientists at the laboratory. I have
4 devoted my career to cleaning up the legacy of the
5 Cold War. My personal efforts have reduced the
6 number of nuclear weapons and cleaned up the legacy
7 of the Cold War. My goals are the same as the goals
8 of many of the concerned citizens as these public
9 hearings. We only differ in the means we have to
10 achieve these goals.

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

19 As one of the scientific leaders of the
20 lab, I remind everybody that there is well over 2,000
21 metric tons of plutonium throughout the world in
22 various forms. Regardless of your views on how this
23 situation came to be, it is clear that these large
24 inventories must be prudently managed for many
25 centuries. To succeed, we are going to have to

1 stabilize and store excess plutonium. We must secure
2 it against theft and diversion. We must improve our
3 understanding of plutonium by continuing to work at
4 the frontiers of science.

5 By way of example, consider that in support
6 of the Moscow treaty, my colleagues just destroyed
7 one-third of a metric ton of plutonium pits, and they
8 proposed to continue that every year. We stabilized
9 well over 20 metric tons of plutonium across the
10 complex for safe storage. I helped develop the
11 scientific understanding of plutonium contamination
12 in the soils at Rocky Flats that enabled the most
13 significant clean-up in the history of Superfund
14 legislation. We cleaned up a 385-acre industrial
15 complex. We decontaminated and removed 805 concrete
16 structures, and we remediated over 12,000 tons of
17 contaminated soil. My message is, that my generation
18 and my colleagues are achieving the nuclear weapons
19 reduction and environmental clean-up goals that we
20 are all looking for.

21 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

22 MR. CLARK: We have the same goals. Our
23 generation is getting results, but modern, safe, and
24 secure facilities are crucial. Complex
25 transformation is a positive means to achieve those

1 goals of cleaning up the legacy. Thank you.

2 MR. LARSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
3 is Bob Putnam, and then it will be Sasha Pyle and
4 Scott Kovac.

5 MR. BOB PUTNAM: Thank you for the
6 opportunity to comment. Ladies and gentlemen, I was
7 born in Colorado and raised in the shadow of Rocky
8 Flats in the Denver area. I and my family, my wife
9 and two children live in Los Alamos. My wife is a
10 Japanese national. Her parents grew up at the time
11 the Nagasaki and Hiroshima bombs were dropped. My
12 mother-in-law lived in the shadow of Nagasaki.

13 I grew up, received my degree as a
14 scientist from Princeton University. With that
15 pedigree and the location that I work, and the fact
16 that I speak Japanese, I have had many wonderful
17 opportunities to speak with my in-laws, to speak with
18 their family members, about the advisability and
19 justifiability in their eyes for the use of the
20 nuclear weapon. Today, in their eyes, knowing what I
21 do today, as an employee of Los Alamos National
22 Laboratory, they still praise me for what I do.

23 Ladies and gentlemen, I am the project
24 director for pit manufacturing at Los Alamos National
25 Laboratory. And as a citizen, as a father, as a

1 husband to a Japanese family, I support this
2 preferred alternative, and with that pedigree, I
3 thank you for your time.

4 MR. LARSON: Our next speaker is Sasha Pyle
5 and Scott Kovac and Jerry Fuentes.

6 MS. SASHA PYLE: I am Sasha Pyle. I don't
7 live in Española. I am a carpetbagger and drove up
8 here from Santa Fe like a few others. I can honestly
9 say I love this town. I love the landscape, the
10 people, the culture, the style, the humor, the food.
11 I love your mayor.

12 And I hope you forgive some of us from
13 Santa Fe for coming up here to speak here, but I
14 wanted to say whether you do or don't believe that
15 the lab is the economic engine for this part of the
16 country, whether you do or do not believe that your
17 family depends on nuclear weapons manufacturing for
18 job security, you need to step back and realize that
19 whether the DOE resumes industrial scale
20 manufacturing of plutonium pits in this country is
21 not a local issue. This is not about local pork
22 dollars. This is about sweeping national policy with
23 vast global consequences.

24 We are about to have an election. We are
25 going to have a new administration. That new

1 administration is mandated by Congress to issue a
2 revised and updated nuclear posture review to replace
3 the outdated 2000 one that this complex
4 transformation is based on. And in addition to that,
5 Congress has recently impaneled a 12 person,
6 bilateral commission to review the strategic posture
7 of the United States, and that 12 person panel will
8 very likely come up with some new findings about our
9 strategic posture in the world that will be
10 incorporated into the new nuclear posture review.

11 The only reason for the timing of this
12 complex transformation proposal is politics, is to
13 rush it through before the election. So in 20 years
14 of reading and writing and thinking and talking about
15 the environmental and economic impacts of DOE
16 programs on northern New Mexico -- where, by the way,
17 I also have a home and business and a family, and I
18 know how hard it is to make a living here -- my sense
19 of Española in this issue is that this community is
20 thoughtful but somewhat divided. There are people
21 who want the job security and want the economic
22 stability, and there are people who are very
23 concerned about the public health risk and the
24 environmental consequences of this toxic facility up
25 on the hill, and those two groups are not mutually

1 exclusive. There is some overlap between those two
2 groups, and that makes it complicated.

3 But this isn't a local issue. So the good
4 news is that New Mexico is poised on the brink of
5 greatness, that we do all have all these things here
6 that could be put to good use and can have a future,
7 which nuclear weapons doesn't have a future. It's a
8 dead-end industry.

9 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds.

10 MS. PYLE: The other good news is that the
11 lab is not going away. So if we say, no, complex
12 transformation is not moving forward right now, the
13 lab is not going to close and jobs are not going to
14 be lost right this second. There are still going to
15 be jobs and money here. We just want to say what
16 kind of jobs, jobs that we can be proud of or jobs
17 that we are not so proud of.

18 The other thing is that the waste is a
19 local issue. The extra 5 or 600 cubic yards of
20 plutonium contaminated transuranic waste that have no
21 plan and no place of where to go, because WIPP is
22 spoken for already with legacy waste from the complex
23 all over the country, and you don't see the polluted
24 facilities that are still there on the map. They
25 have been neatly removed, but they are still polluted

1 and they are sitting on tons of waste. That waste is
2 already reserved to go to WIPP, and so the extra
3 plutonium contaminated waste that would result from
4 beefing up pit manufacturing at Los Alamos has
5 nowhere to go. We are going to be stuck with it
6 here.

7 We are also going to be stuck with having
8 to come up with another 43 million gallons of water
9 every year for this preferred alternative. I don't
10 think we have that kind of water. What I'm going to
11 recommend is that people make a distinction in their
12 minds between what is national and international
13 policy, and what the actual regional consequences of
14 this decision are. Our regional consequences are
15 going to be environmental, because jobs don't last
16 and pollution does. Thank you very much.

17 MR. LARSON: Okay. Our next speaker is
18 Scott Kovac, then Jerry Fuentes and Jean Nichols.

19 MR. SCOTT KOVAC: Good evening, thank you.
20 My name is Scott Kovac. I am with Nuclear Watch New
21 Mexico. I want to thank the Mayor. I think I saw
22 him. I want to thank everyone for allowing us to
23 have this meeting in this lovely facility.

24 All these paintings behind us show a long
25 history of this area, and it makes me wonder, you

1 know, what will Los Alamos' final legacy be? What
2 can we do with Los Alamos, you know, up here? What
3 would that look like?

4 The SPEIS, the Environmental Impact
5 Statement is written in a manner that is hard to
6 read. It's difficult, it's very lengthy. The
7 reference documents are very lengthy. The tables at
8 the end of the summary are difficult for some of us
9 to get the actual environmental impacts of the
10 preferred alternative. The environmental impacts of
11 the preferred alternative should be prominently
12 displayed and easily accessible to all. Because they
13 are not, we respectfully request an extension of 90
14 days.

15 Sasha mentioned the true waste. Also to be
16 generated will be more low level radioactive wastes
17 due to the preferred alternative, should it happen.
18 These wastes will be disposed of at Area G. Area G
19 is due to be closed in 2015. There is still time for
20 the public to convince the New Mexico Environment
21 Department to require LANL to remove this waste
22 rather than cap and cover and leave it in place as
23 the lab plans. However, LANL also plans to expand
24 Area G into zone four, will be much of the same --
25 unlined dumps above our aquifer that will likely

1 leave radioactive wastes permanently.

2 I support a no production alternative,
3 leaving, stopping -- stopping the no pit production,
4 leaving LANL to curate our weapons stockpile while it
5 awaits dismantlement.

6 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

7 MR. KOVAC: Thank you.

8 MR. LARSON: Just while Mr. Fuentes is
9 coming in, I would just like to give you how we are
10 doing. We are averaging about three minutes. I very
11 much appreciate your sticking to that. At this rate,
12 however, we are still going to be well after 11:00
13 before everyone finishes, so just a reminder.
14 Mr. Fuentes to be followed by Jean Nichols and Pete
15 Padilla.

16 MR. JERRY FUENTES: My name is Jerry
17 Fuentes. From 1978 to 1983, I worked at the
18 plutonium assay section at Los Alamos National
19 Laboratories and the old Seymour Building, the
20 current one now. What I took from that in firsthand
21 experience, I saw spills that occurred in this
22 laboratory, that it was amazing what would happen,
23 man-caused spills. I saw mechanical error. I saw
24 many things that happened. I myself was contaminated
25 five times. I saw the amount of plutonium and

1 uranium trash that we created at the laboratory, at
2 the CMR building. I saw the amounts of water we used
3 to wash these elements that we did, these
4 radionuclides, and I also saw what was released into
5 the atmosphere. I have been there. I have firsthand
6 knowledge.

7 I tell you right now, we don't need any
8 more pits. We should clean up the mess that we made
9 now, and we shouldn't make any more messes anymore in
10 the future. We don't need this. We can do without
11 it. Thank you.

12 MR. LARSON: Thank you, Mr. Fuentes. Our
13 next speaker is Jean Nichols, and then to be followed
14 by Pete Padilla and Erich Kuerschner.

15 MS. JEAN NICHOLS: I am Jean Nichols
16 Penasco, and, you know, security is about feeling
17 safe. Nuclear weapons have never made us feel safe.
18 Last year on the 4th of July, I got a phone call that
19 the dust in my house was high, with elevated levels
20 of strontium 90. For about six months, I didn't even
21 dare sweep my house. I was told by members of the
22 lab that I needed to wear a protective mask to sweep
23 up. Now, I don't see television programs showing the
24 Swifter Duster and people wearing masks. So, you
25 know, there needs to be disclosure. We need to have

1 more testing in our areas to find out if this is true
2 in other places.

3 True, this was dust that was from back when
4 the Sierra Grande fire happened, but, you know, since
5 then I have collected the two to three month dust,
6 the two to three year dust. I have all kinds. So we
7 need to test all this stuff.

8 You know, when people are concerned about
9 jobs at the lab, I think there would be a lot more
10 jobs created for clean-up than there is for pit
11 production. You know, the pits, we also can't look
12 at this issue without looking at Rocky Flats. Rocky
13 Flats was closed in 1989 because of massive
14 environmental problems, and out of the hearings that
15 came after that -- meanwhile, of course, the death
16 records in Colorado are frozen. I don't know if they
17 are still frozen, but they were for a long time --
18 three things came out of that, there is no filtering
19 system capable of filtering plutonium; the drift from
20 Rocky Flats went further than ever expected; and
21 everyplace that has ever made plutonium pit triggers
22 has had high levels of childhood leukemia.

23 We have been burying people. We just last
24 month buried a woman in Penasco who died of massive
25 cancer from the lab. Doctors in Albuquerque have

1 told us, you know, you have the highest level of
2 cancer in the state and miscarriages. But are there
3 health studies? Does that come out? Not too much.
4 I am in support of the no production alternative, you
5 know, in place of like the no action alternative is
6 what we are already doing. These new plutonium pits,
7 also I looked online, and they involve like 73
8 changes from old pits. So I can see down the line,
9 and I also saw it in the paperwork, that what they
10 are talking about in the future is more underground
11 testing.

12 What happened to the nonproliferation
13 treaty? I mean, we are not supposed to be testing,
14 and I see that this is something that will lead to
15 more testing if we do this. We need to not do it.
16 We need a lab that we can be proud of that is, you
17 know, dealing with energy, like wave power, wind
18 power, water power. If you want to do something
19 dangerous, you know, check out lightning. Let's get
20 energy from other sources, you know. I think if we
21 just went with commonsense, you know, and peace and,
22 you know, it's insane. We have got an insane
23 government who is trying to treat us like we are the
24 insane lunatic fringe for objecting to it.

25 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

1 MS. NICHOLS: It's nuts. But thank you for
2 doing this hearing here in Española. We really
3 needed this. I'm going to turn in some information
4 about the dust in my house and also about Rocky Flats
5 and also request the 90 day extension of time.

6 MR. LARSON: Thank you very much.

7 Our next speaker is Pete Padilla and then
8 Erich Kuerschner and Astrid Webster.

9 MR. G. PETE PADILLA: Good evening. My
10 name is Pete Padilla. I work for Los Alamos County,
11 but my views are my own tonight. I do not support
12 the preferred alternative, nor do I support pit
13 production in Los Alamos County. My job with the
14 county is environmental compliance specialist. I go
15 out with Los Alamos National Laboratory personnel and
16 state personnel and monitor our water for the
17 residents of Los Alamos County.

18 I have issues with some of the legacy
19 wastes from LANL. We have one well that concerns me
20 with the perchloride issue. I also am concerned
21 about PCBs, RDX, which are the high explosives of our
22 legacy wastes from LANL, and probably our wastes from
23 current lab activities. I just would like to say
24 that as my job takes me across the plateau, these
25 wastes will be there for quite a long time, and I

1 think we should take heed as to what we are putting
2 out to the environment. And that's all I would like
3 to say. Thank you.

4 MR. LARSON: Thank you, sir.

5 Our next speaker is Erich Kuerschner.

6 Mr. Kuerschner will be followed by Astrid Webster and
7 Monica Steinhoff.

8 MR. ERICH KUERSCHNER: Thank you for the
9 opportunity to speak. I am speaking mostly as a
10 citizen. I live up in Taos, but I was trained -- I
11 started out in nuclear engineering, but I switched
12 and have my graduate degree in economics. I worked
13 on my first EIS in 1972 for Skidmore, Owings &
14 Merrill on the Mount Hood freeway at a time when NEPA
15 was being followed and EIS statements were really
16 real. So I know the difference, and I can tell you
17 that this is not a real EIS statement.

18 And I think Sasha had it right. I mean,
19 basically what I see is happening is that Ignacio, in
20 last week's paper, in San Francisco said he agreed,
21 yeah, we can't do pits around Livermore. We have to
22 get the plutonium out of here. It's making us a
23 target. Environmental hazards and terrorist threats
24 are too great, so let's move it to Los Alamos.

25 The other reason I say it's not legitimate,

1 under NEPA, you are required to do a no build. But
2 what happened here is we haven't built pits since
3 1989. As far as I know, there is nothing that
4 requires us, as that first comment in the summary
5 that says, they are required to produce plutonium
6 pits. We haven't produced any since 1989. Well,
7 they quickly tried to produce a few, in my opinion,
8 just so they would have a benchmark, just to get the
9 threshold, just to say that the no base period is
10 producing some pits. I mean, it's really a sham.

11 The second reason I say that, when you take
12 graduate economics at UCLA, the first thing you learn
13 is any time you hear the word needs or requirements,
14 it's a trigger. The person saying that has no desire
15 to do a benefit cost analysis or do a study, because
16 the conclusion has already been reached. Well, in
17 the first two comments in the summary thing, I
18 counted 11 times they said needs and requirements.
19 And as best as I can tell, Congress has made it clear
20 that they don't want to fund the RRW or the CMR
21 himself, the building that's a factory to build those
22 things. And basically this is just an attempt to try
23 to further this thing on, I guess, executive
24 privilege, because the president says we need nuclear
25 weapons.

1 It still, in my opinion, doesn't absolve
2 this group from studying whether or not pits are
3 needed or what the alternatives are.

4 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds.

5 MR. KUERSCHNER: Real quickly, I want to
6 say, then, we have the socioeconomic impacts wrong.
7 I mean, when we talk about jobs doing something at
8 Los Alamos, it serves no good. This is a negative.
9 This is not a positive. What you are doing is you
10 are taking resources, people out of teaching kids,
11 building houses, doing what's productive, and all the
12 rest of us have to make up for that. I mean, this is
13 not anything that is any good for Española. It does
14 help the people that have the jobs, but all the rest
15 of us have to make up for it.

16 And you can't measure economic well-being
17 by jobs. If I could -- how much time do I have left?
18 I just wanted to read a statement. I don't want to
19 go over my time. But from the White Rose Society,
20 because my father also has 30 some years, and I think
21 he would agree. He saw that this is senseless, the
22 arms race was senseless.

23 What they say, "Do not forget that every
24 people deserve the regime they are willing to endure"
25 -- this is by the students in Munich in 1942 --

1 "nothing is so unworthy of a civilized nation of
2 allowing itself to be governed without opposition by
3 an irresponsible clique that has yielded to base
4 instinct. It is certain that today that every honest
5 German is ashamed of his government. Who among us
6 has any conception of the dimensions of shame that
7 will befall us and our children when one day the veil
8 has fallen from our eyes, and the most horrible of
9 crimes, crimes that infinitely outdistance every
10 human measure reach the light of day."

11 Well, that's basically what we have here.
12 It takes 15 nuclear weapons to destroy an economy.
13 It takes 50 to destroy a country. We have 5,000
14 active, another 5,000 with still the pits in them,
15 and we are talking about building more. I mean, this
16 is just -- I could just guarantee, having grown up
17 with somebody who built weapons for Hitler and
18 started in this country in 1945, your children will
19 grow up to despise you.

20 MR. LARSON: Before we go further, let me
21 just check with the court reporter. How are you
22 doing?

23 THE COURT REPORTER: I would just like some
24 water.

25 MR. LARSON: We have some Rio Grande water

1 here somewhere.

2 Jackie, is it possible we could have some
3 water for the court reporter?

4 Okay. Our next speaker is Astrid Webster.
5 She will be followed by Monica Steinhoff and Melissa
6 Larson.

7 MS. ASTRID WEBSTER: I am from Albuquerque,
8 and my sister is going to follow me. Monica and I
9 all grew up together in Alamogordo, so we know what
10 it's like to live in the shadow of the missile or the
11 rocket or the bomb. So we are here to report for you
12 and say please don't allow your nation to go through
13 a war to bring you to peace, because it's not going
14 to happen. It's only going to leave someone else in
15 charge of your country. It's only going to lead to
16 walls and more waste.

17 The Pentagon already knows that the
18 greatest danger to our country now is global warming.
19 So I hung my T-shirt upside down, so if you want to
20 study Los Alamos and you want to understand,
21 everything is upside down. Mayor Maestas understands
22 science better than Los Alamos. He knows we need to
23 stop carbon production burning use oil, burning,
24 drilling, all of that, and go to a sustainable
25 environment and energy policy. The only thing that

1 is trickling down from Los Alamos is not jobs, is not
2 money. It's despair, it is violence, and it is the
3 greatest death rate from heroin overdoses in the
4 country.

5 There is a gentleman named Bruce Perry. He
6 is a children's psychiatrist in Houston. He says we
7 are in a period of devolution. He has worked with
8 San Juan Pueblo. He said, the social structures,
9 despair, hopelessness there is like the US in the
10 1930s. Read the hearts of depression, and you can do
11 something about it. We can do something about it.

12 If we let them build this CMRR building,
13 number one, the cost of concrete will go up like you
14 don't believe. And number two, if we let them build
15 it, the pits will come. And that's what Los Alamos
16 is about, it's about the pits. It's living on the
17 hill and creating the Valley of Death below.

18 I have made friends with Matilda, who is 82
19 years old. She has run a restaurant here for 50
20 years. I said, "What was it like before Los Alamos
21 was a pit factory?"

22 And she said, "It was so beautiful here, it
23 was so peaceful, you could grow anything."

24 Well, you know, the nice gentleman from the
25 New Mexico Environment Department said clean up.

1 Well, the thing nobody tells you -- language upside
2 down again -- is the New Mexico Environment
3 Department has no control of the radionuclides at Los
4 Alamos. So when you talk about cleaning up, they
5 don't mean the really dangerous stuff, the stuff
6 that's going to last 200 some thousand years. So
7 believe in your kids, believe in your future, and
8 turn the Española Valley back into the bread basket
9 of New Mexico, because that's where your future lies.
10 Thank you very much.

11 MR. LARSON: Appreciate it. All right.
12 The next speaker is Monica Steinhoff and then Melissa
13 Larson and Julie Sutherland.

14 MS. MONICA STEINHOFF: I am Monica
15 Steinhoff. I am a painter, and I grew up in
16 Alamogordo, just like my sister and Erich, and have
17 lived here for more than -- returned here after going
18 to Berkley 33 years ago or something.

19 You know, if we paid as much for bread as
20 we do for nuclear weapons, then you could make a lot
21 of money in Española. Wouldn't that be much better?
22 Because you hear over and over, the money -- the
23 water is going to go to either Las Campanas Golf
24 Courses or making bombs in Los Alamos. So there
25 won't be any water for agriculture in New Mexico, but

1 if we could get the government -- and if we were
2 really a democracy we could do that.

3 I agree with the people who have said,
4 there is not an alternative on this thing that we saw
5 that says no pits at all. You know, in Alamogordo I
6 learned in high school -- which was like 50 years
7 ago, seriously, more than that even -- I learned we
8 would deal with the waste before we ever made any
9 bombs at all. That's obviously not true. That's one
10 thing. We hear all kinds of things from our
11 government that ends up not being true.

12 And I think that, along with several of the
13 speakers, that building should never be built,
14 because first of all, we are seven trillion in debt.
15 Who is funding that trillion? China, Japan, and
16 Saudi Arabia. If they didn't think that we were
17 doing ourselves in and were weakening our superpower
18 by being in debt to them, they wouldn't give us that
19 money. Eisenhower even said -- another quote to
20 Eisenhower -- "Every bomb that is made is stealing
21 from the children." Because a bomb is just a black
22 hole. It does no good to anybody.

23 The man who spoke about Hiroshima and
24 Nagasaki, he is living in a circular world. He only
25 talks to himself. He thinks his wife is talking to

1 him and the mother and everybody. You know, I was
2 bombed when I was two years old. I am still working
3 on that. When I am up here my knees shake, my voice
4 shakes, everything, because I know what a bomb is
5 like. I can not see how any normal human being, with
6 a heart in their breast, could think about making a
7 bomb.

8 You know, what have we destroyed in Iraq
9 all these years? We haven't used a nuclear bomb.
10 There are still people like McCain who says, we would
11 have won in Vietnam if we used the nuclear bomb.
12 Don't you think that's madness? It's inconceivable
13 to me how we could do that. So I think that we
14 should make our government be honest, stop borrowing
15 money. You know, there was a Republican whose name I
16 don't remember who came here and said, Los Alamos is
17 the most egregious corporate welfare he has ever
18 seen.

19 And these people who go around talking
20 about this, just want it to continue. I know lots of
21 Los Alamos scientists. Not a single one has ever
22 admitted working on anything that's not benign. They
23 all say, I am working on medicine. I looked at these
24 pictures. The whole time I was sitting here I was
25 thinking, if we are so proud of the bomb, why aren't

1 there bombs in these pictures? You know, I put bombs
2 in my pictures and nobody will show them in New
3 Mexico. If we were so proud of the bomb making, why
4 don't we really show them everywhere.

5 Just like Alamogordo, it has these bombs
6 that you can see. I haven't ever seen a bomb here.
7 So we should be honest. We do need jobs everywhere,
8 but I have looked at economic analysis over and over
9 of New Mexico, and like someone said, we wouldn't be
10 on the bottom of the list. We could do solar. We
11 can make new forms of energy, so people can drive
12 cars without creating global warming. So thank you
13 for being here, all of you.

14 MR. LARSON: I would like to call Melissa
15 Larson. She will be followed by Julie Sutherland and
16 Alan Sutherland.

17 MS. MELISSA LARSON: Safe, secure, reliable
18 nonproliferation.

19 MR. LARSON: Just a little closer to the
20 microphone.

21 MS. LARSON: So I don't think there is
22 anything safe, secure, and reliable about anything
23 that this complex transformation is offering. We
24 really need to go with the reasonable alternatives of
25 nonproliferation. This is a complex transformation

1 to think about, not building these things, but we
2 need to go forward and really understand the US
3 plutonium plants, weapons waste, and proliferation.

4 The Congress should cut funding for
5 expanding production of plutonium pits, including
6 funding for the consolidated plutonium center. The
7 Congress should bar any funding for the development
8 and production of reliable replacement warhead pits.
9 Congress should cancel funding for the plutonium
10 mixed oxide fuel program, and approve funding for
11 plutonium immobilization. Congress should order an
12 investigation of the missing plutonium at Los Alamos.

13 So we really need to consider all these
14 things that have been going on. What are the long
15 term needs? The people who live in northern New
16 Mexico have long term needs which don't include this
17 complex transformation. The alternative is to simply
18 stop this production. Elimination of this project,
19 for the sake of the land, air quality, water
20 resources, biotic resources, cultural resources. And
21 waste management impacts, what impact assessments
22 have been made about accidents? Even cumulative
23 impacts of waste which continue to seep into the
24 water.

25 Rocky Flats has become Superfund site due

1 to contamination from plutonium pits. It is easy to
2 imagine another fire in the mountains around Los
3 Alamos, and what if a nuclear accident occurs? So I
4 think we need to really consider all of these things
5 that are happening today in the world, and I have
6 also got actually a thing I just happened across the
7 other day. This is called the --

8 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

9 MS. LARSON: Thirty seconds -- Nuclear
10 Weapons Danger, Muslim Christian Study and Action
11 Guide on Nuclear Weapons Danger. And in essence,
12 there are so many things that this thing really goes
13 into, but I think that we really need to think about
14 how we all belong to this earth, and we agree that
15 the Christian and Muslim traditions are unambiguous
16 about the sanctity of human life and the protection
17 of all forms of human life including the environment.
18 We believe in the dignity of all human beings and
19 their roles as trustees and humble custodians of the
20 earth and their responsibility for the needs of
21 future generations. And we just believe that we
22 don't need any more proliferation of weapons, and we
23 do need peace, and we do need clean up, and we do
24 need to see a future for this land and for all the
25 people that live here.

1 MR. LARSON: Thank you very much.

2 Our next speaker is Julie Sutherland to be
3 followed by Alan Sutherland and Bonnie Bonneau.

4 And, Ms. Sutherland, before you start, let
5 people move and get where they are going to go, so we
6 can settle down first.

7 MS. JULIE SUTHERLAND: Hi, I am a citizen
8 of New Mexico and Taos County. I am speaking tonight
9 to support immediate clean-up of the more than 2,000
10 designated sites Los Alamos National Laboratory has
11 contaminated during the last 60 some years of its
12 existence. The storm water that flows down the
13 canyons from Los Alamos to the Rio Grande has been
14 found to contain as much as 38,000 times the
15 allowable US clean water levels of certain
16 pollutants, like cancer causing PCBs, not to mention
17 high explosives and radionuclides. These discharges
18 are outrageous and must be stopped. Monitoring of
19 the problem over the next seven years is just not
20 enough. Compliance should be enforced and weapons
21 production halted until clean-up of the existing
22 contamination occurs.

23 And this is to the New Mexico Environment
24 Department and the EPA and DOE. Please take
25 immediate steps to protect us and the environment

1 from this monstrous situation. How many more lives
2 must be sacrificed before Los Alamos changes its
3 mission from weapons production to environmental
4 restoration? Please, please quit desecrating our
5 earth, air, and water. Now is the time. We refuse
6 to stand idly by while we are declared a nuclear
7 sacrifice zone of this nation. No to plutonium pit
8 production. Thank you.

9 MR. LARSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
10 is Alan Sutherland and then Bonnie Bonneau and
11 Reverend Holly Beaumont.

12 MR. ALAN SUTHERLAND: Thank you all so much
13 for having this meeting, and I am so glad to see
14 everyone here and the kind of response we are
15 getting.

16 Yes, this is the pits. When I hear words
17 like how attractive is nuclear destruction, when I
18 hear centers of excellence, I start to wonder if
19 maybe there is a little smoke screen going on here
20 about what the actual thing is. The basic premise is
21 insane. It's based on uncertain fears, fictitious --
22 I sound like Michael Moore -- threats of tens of
23 thousands of nuclear warheads. How can you use even
24 one? Already depleted uranium, which is from the
25 waste, is being used worldwide in our wars. We

1 already have nuclear war going on.

2 Complex transformation, what we need is
3 spiritual transformation. Getting rid of the poison,
4 stop making more of this stuff. Cutting the
5 stockpile in half is still more than enough to
6 destroy the whole planet. Smaller molecules, we
7 would end up in smaller molecules, that's about the
8 only difference. You still have 60 years of poison
9 buried in the lab. Your mommy didn't teach you to
10 clean up your mess before going out to play, and the
11 cost, perhaps one reason they talk about cutting down
12 their stockpiles is because the war is cutting into
13 their production. So it's sort of a Catch-22. It's
14 destroying the lab itself.

15 So let's get into solar energy. Let's get
16 into cleaning up our precious water. When I see the
17 fumes from the fire going over to Penasco and the
18 dust-laden houses there, I'm sorry. Our children are
19 not -- we are not going to survive. And why all the
20 secrecy? What about democracy, okay? I am so glad
21 to see everyone here, because this is democracy.

22 And I will just read my last little thing
23 here. Let's shut down the lab. No, I don't want to
24 shut it down. I want jobs. I want the scientists.

25 I am a scientist. I am disgusted with the

1 way scientists have performed. A scientist needs a
2 heart besides his brain. I'm sorry. All right. The
3 greatest scientific pool on the planet, we must now
4 direct toward a beautiful, viable self-sustaining
5 future. To absurdly build weapons of mass
6 destruction must stop. Health, clean air, energy are
7 more important. The future of our children, new and
8 better jobs will be created. We can take care of
9 each other in a loving way. Put down the weapons of
10 pollution. We all have lots of good positive work to
11 do. Thank you.

12 MR. LARSON: Thank you, sir.

13 Our next speaker is Bonnie Bonneau, to be
14 followed by Holly Beaumont and Alva Morrison.

15 MS. BONNIE BONNEAU: Greetings. I am
16 Bonnie Bonneau.

17 MR. LARSON: Can I have you step just a
18 little closer to the microphone, please?

19 MS. BONNEAU: A little closer, is that
20 enough?

21 MR. LARSON: I think that's probably
22 better. It's actually the smaller one that's
23 carrying your voice.

24 MS. BONNEAU: Okay. I am representing the
25 Legions of Living Light, and I am from the Taos area.

1 And I think that, if you are looking at environmental
2 impacts, you have to study the environmental site in
3 Los Alamos, where it's perched, up on these volcanic
4 craters. It's between this huge volcanic crater and
5 something called a rift, where there is a fault,
6 bigger than a fault, under the Rio Grande. There is
7 something that at some points is seven miles deep.
8 There is a crack under the Rio Grande called a rift,
9 and you have volcanoes up there. It's a very
10 unstable geological area, or at least potentially
11 unstable.

12 And the wildfires, the basic wild nature of
13 the area, prevents it -- makes it very difficult to
14 get up and down the roads with emergency vehicles and
15 with the kind of care. Rocky Flats was famous for
16 its plutonium fires in pit production. They were
17 like dragging the Denver Fire Department out there to
18 be putting out fires hundreds of times a year, and
19 very dangerous fires. You know, the smoke and the
20 fire itself was really not a common fire whatsoever.
21 And they were not even equipped to deal with the
22 fires. The fire departments which were expected to
23 deal with them didn't have the equipment to protect
24 themselves or the kind of equipment really required
25 to fight a plutonium fire.

1 And Los Alamos is so much farther away, and
2 the roads are so much more precarious to get to in
3 case of an emergency. That even if it weren't for
4 volcanoes and giant rifts, that really if you had to
5 do this, you could like -- but I don't really believe
6 you have to do it at all much. I think that you need
7 to have, you know, much better alternatives, that if
8 you were going to transform the labs, you would
9 transform them into life-affirming places, with
10 health clean-up, you know, find cures for diseases
11 and decontamination methods to clean up the messes
12 that they have already made.

13 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

14 MS. BONNEAU: I mean, if you spent the
15 amount of time they spent trying to torture the truth
16 out of people, into like friendly, socialized ways to
17 compromise and share information, you know, I mean,
18 the world could be so much of a better place if the
19 mission were to transform it into a very good,
20 positive influence, spiritual and metaphysically for
21 the whole country, if they transform these weapons --
22 you know, swords into ploughshares, like they say.

23 MR. LARSON: Thank you.

24 Holly Beaumont is next. And if you just
25 hang on, Ms. Beaumont, for a second while we let

1 people leave. Ms. Beaumont will be followed by Alva
2 Morrison and Clarissa Durán.

3 REVEREND HOLLY BEAUMONT: I am Reverend
4 Holly Beaumont. I am the legislative advocate for
5 the New Mexico Conference of Churches, with a
6 membership of over 800,000 Protestants and Catholics
7 across the State of New Mexico. Ever since we
8 learned about Complex 2030, which has now been
9 changed to Complex Transformation, we have made this
10 our priority in the State of New Mexico.

11 We share the concern that was expressed by
12 Pope John Paul at the UN Security Council, when he
13 said, "The continual preparation for war,
14 demonstrated by the production of ever more numerous,
15 powerful, and sophisticated weapons, shows that there
16 is a desire to be ready for war, and being ready
17 means able to start it. It also means taking the
18 risk that sometime, somewhere, someone can set in
19 motion the terrible mechanism of general
20 destruction."

21 We remember the words of General Omar
22 Bradley on Veterans' Day in 1948, just a few years
23 after the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. He
24 said, "The world has achieved brilliance without
25 wisdom, power without conscience. Ours is a world of

1 nuclear giants and ethical infants. We know more
2 about war than we know about peace, more about
3 killing than we know about living."

4 We believe that the people of New Mexico
5 will change the direction of our future in New
6 Mexico. We believe that your efforts are
7 transforming New Mexico into the epicenter of hope
8 for the entire planet. We believe and pray, with
9 many others, that nuclear weapons are rapidly
10 becoming irrelevant, and I would quote Eric Hoffer
11 who said, "In times of profound change, it is the
12 learners who inherit the future. The learned find
13 themselves beautifully equipped to live in a world
14 that no longer exists."

15 We believe that the people of New Mexico
16 will no longer allow themselves to be held hostage to
17 an industry that requires them to choose between a
18 paycheck and their health and the health of the
19 environment. We believe that to save our jobs and
20 the labs, we must truly transform them from
21 industries of death into industries that are
22 life-enhancing and life-sustaining, and that this
23 country is called to lead the world forward
24 multi-lateral, verifiable nuclear disarmament.

25 We believe that the Prophet Isaiah spoke to

1 us when he said, "They shall beat their swords into
2 ploughshares and their spears into pruning hooks.
3 Nations shall not lift sword against nation, neither
4 shall they learn war anymore." Amen, and amen.

5 MR. LARSON: Thank you.

6 Our next speaker is Alva Morrison and
7 Clarissa Durán and Joni Arends.

8 MR. ALVA MORRISON: Thank you. I am Alva
9 Morrison from Dixon. I am a parciente of the Acequia
10 de la Plaza, and I am a home energy consultant. And
11 I have lost count of how times I have heard this --
12 what do they call it? A mantra? "Safer, more
13 secure." Well, somebody real smart -- I think they
14 were here earlier -- just found out today where it's
15 coming from. It's coming from a major international
16 public relations firm called Burson-Marsteller. This
17 is the first time that Los Alamos has maintained a
18 high-powered public relations firm like this to run
19 their agenda for them. But this is why you are
20 hearing such a carefully concocted line.

21 I have somewhat of an alternative line I
22 would like to put out here, in case anybody wants to
23 join me later in saying it a few more times. What we
24 are talking about is more nuclear bomb production --
25 more. And we know from what is in the preferred

1 alternative, in the PEIS, that there is a request for
2 more ability to pollute, more air pollution permits,
3 more water pollution permits, and massive need, as
4 was explained by the good lady from Santa Fe, for
5 more water consumption and grabbing up of water
6 rights.

7 So more nuclear production -- more nuclear
8 bomb production means more wind-blown, radioactive
9 dust contamination, more pollution of our drinking
10 water, which we share -- Española Valley, Santa Fe,
11 everybody, we know now shares the drinking water, and
12 more water grabs, less water for us to farm and use
13 in our houses. And as a parciante, I want to know,
14 where is this water going to come from? Is it going
15 to come from my ditch? Is it going to come from my
16 neighbor's ditch up the hill? Whose fields are going
17 to have to be dried out to make these bombs?

18 So there is one other thing I want to talk
19 about that's very closely related here, and there was
20 a study recently done by some local people in our
21 area, with the help of the New Mexico Environment
22 Department, and we found -- we were looking for
23 radioactive contamination, and we found that in our
24 acequias and in our land, it's still pretty much
25 okay. There are some things we have a few questions

1 about. It looks like we are fairly safe in our
2 valley, in the Embudo Valley, we don't know about
3 anybody else. It hasn't been studied very much, but
4 we found massive contamination at high altitudes in
5 the Sangre de Cristo Mountains, cesium 137 almost at
6 action levels, which means the polluters actually
7 have to clean it up.

8 In the Programmatic Environmental Impact
9 Statement, before we can proceed with more nuclear
10 production, we have some questions that have to be
11 answered. What is the source of this nuclear bomb
12 related material that's in our mountains? What is
13 the health danger to us? We don't know. We know
14 there is a lot of it there, way more than anywhere
15 else in one location. We don't know what the other
16 locations are, where it might be that are also at
17 high altitude. We don't know if it's getting in the
18 fish, in the animals that live there. We don't know.

19 We need to have these questions -- we need
20 to know how far down the mountain it's come. We took
21 a sample at 11,400 feet, the next lower one was at
22 just around 8,000 feet. Well, that leaves a lot of
23 room in between there that we don't know what is
24 going on. These are questions, environmental
25 questions that need to be answered before anything

1 proceeds with this Programmatic Environmental Impact
2 Statement. Thank you.

3 MR. LARSON: Thank you.

4 Our next speaker is Clarissa Durán, and
5 just to give you a heads up, after Ms. Durán, we have
6 Joni Arends and Kerby Goforth. Then we will have two
7 other people. That means five more people about
8 quarter past 9:00 and we're going to take a short
9 break.

10 Ms. Durán, please.

11 MS. CLARISSA DURÁN: Good evening,
12 everyone, so good to see you all here. My name is
13 Clarissa Durán. Most of you know me. I grew up with
14 a lot of you here. I am really happy to see some of
15 the people that I didn't think would be here tonight.
16 Like Richard Cook and Mrs. Honstein and Mrs. Finch,
17 and to see my brothers and sisters who don't share my
18 opinion, which is that bombs are just wrong, and that
19 it's time to stop making bombs, here and all over the
20 world.

21 And the reason that I can say that with a
22 very clear conscience is that I am a war wife. My
23 husband spent eight months across the world in a
24 desert, not unlike the deserts here, creating
25 destruction, and I waited for him. And when he came

1 home, our family had to deal with the posttraumatic
2 stress disorder. It pulled us apart, and it's
3 destroyed families all around the world. And that's
4 all that these weapons can do, is destroy human
5 beings and our earth. And because we live here in
6 the most sacred, beautiful place on earth, we ought
7 to know better. Jobs are not worth the lives that we
8 have destroyed. Yes, we have to feed our families,
9 but are we willing to make things that destroy others
10 for those paychecks.

11 I think the people who live here and work
12 in Los Alamos would do almost any kind of work,
13 because they love their families so much, and that's
14 a beautiful thing. But what I want to say to you is
15 that we are not dependent on Los Alamos. Los Alamos
16 owes us that money. It owes all of New Mexico. It
17 owes the world this money, because all you do is take
18 from us. That's what you have done since the first
19 time you came here.

20 Behind me are scenes of the colonization of
21 this area, the destruction of some of the heart and
22 soul of this area, and I am here to say that we will
23 not allow that to continue. Your time is over. And
24 that type of painting, whether you are young or old,
25 that type of thinking, that's finished. We are a new

1 generation of people, and we demand to have the
2 technology be used -- these scientists with their
3 brilliant minds -- be used for purposes that support
4 life.

5 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

6 MS. DURÁN: Yesterday at Northern New
7 Mexico College -- that's where I work -- and I am so
8 proud of my boss, Dr. Camillo Bustamante and my new
9 boss, Dr. Andy Salazar, for moving forward with new
10 technologies for teaching our young people about what
11 we need to know to move forward as a people. I say
12 to everyone in this audience and everyone who left,
13 if you don't understand this new generation, if you
14 don't understand what we need out of technology, then
15 you are ignorant, and you need to get an education.
16 And I'm sorry to say that to my elders, but you
17 raised me well enough to speak the truth, and I am
18 here before you speaking the truth, and I am saying
19 to you, I will not allow my children or any other
20 children to be sacrificed for money or anything else.
21 Your time is over.

22 MR. LARSON: Okay. Thank you.

23 Our next speaker is Joni Arends. Then
24 Kerby Goforth and Ann Hendrie.

25 MS. JONI ARENDS: I am Joni Arends. I am

1 with Concerned Citizens for Nuclear Safety. And
2 first of all, I would like to renew my request for a
3 90 day extension of time to provide comments. And
4 secondly, my comments now are directed directly to
5 DOE headquarters.

6 So I want to talk about the Department of
7 Energy key facility, which is the Chemistry and
8 Metallurgy Research Replacement building or the CMRR,
9 which is now under construction. We are concerned
10 about the defects with the construction, specifically
11 related to new seismic information. In the 1999
12 SWEIS, there was -- here's the handout here, and I
13 have more, additional copies if anybody would like
14 one.

15 In the '99 SWEIS, they have a few seismic
16 faults here. In 2006, there are many, many more
17 faults, and specifically in the area of the Chemistry
18 and Metallurgy Research Replacement building. So in
19 summer of 2007, the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety
20 Board raised new information about a 50 percent
21 increase in the seismic g force at LANL. The
22 May 2007 study called the Probabilistic Seismic
23 Hazard Analysis, recommends more research into the
24 unique geological characteristics of the Pajarito
25 Plateau. Further, a further seismic study is

1 expected soon.

2 Now, the lower floors of the CMRR have been
3 poured. There is a ten foot thick foundation. The
4 walls are now four and a half feet thick, but they
5 just started construction of the structural steel
6 this week for the upper floors. It's going to be
7 bolted together and then they are going to weld it
8 together.

9 But when we asked DOE on Tuesday night at
10 the CMRR meeting about whether they were installing
11 any type of seismic engineered site safety features
12 one CMRR DOE official said no. He explained that the
13 contract had been let prior to the release of the new
14 seismic data. Well, we all know the nature of
15 construction contracts. Construction contracts have
16 provisions for change orders. Change orders are the
17 essential part of construction contracts. And why
18 there haven't been any kind of change orders to
19 address the seismic issues wrong.

20 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

21 MS. ARENDS: It's plain wrong, and it
22 presents a flagrant disregard for DOE's own
23 requirements. DOE orders say that they need to
24 protect the children, the environment, and the
25 workers' safety. So DOE must implement and a stop

1 work order for the CMRR, now, today, stop work. DOE
2 must review the construction contract with Austin.
3 DOE must investigate what can be done now to install
4 the necessary seismic fasteners and ties.

5 And I have downloaded information from the
6 premier company out of California that has the
7 seismic fasteners and the seismic ties, and so DOE is
8 now on notice that they have got to do the stop
9 order. If it's not done now, we cannot imagine DOE
10 is going to put up the walls and do all the work and
11 then they are going to come back and say, oh, we need
12 to go back and put in the fasteners. So they are
13 going to open up the nuclear weapons facility to
14 install these fasteners in the core of the building,
15 which will just set up a whole set of other issues
16 that we have all experienced over the years.

17 MR. LARSON: Ms. Arends, can I ask you to
18 finish your comments, please.

19 MS. ARENDS: Yes, I am almost done. So we
20 are also concerned about some of the DOE management
21 oversight, that are the same people who were in
22 charge of overseeing the ground water monitoring
23 program at Los Alamos. We request that DOE
24 headquarters review the qualifications of the DOE
25 officials who are in charge of overseeing the CMRR.

1 MR. LARSON: Okay.

2 MS. ARENDS: We are really concerned about
3 this. We are really concerned about this. There is
4 new information about the seismic hazard, a
5 50 percent increase in the g force. DOE needs to
6 step up and deal with this problem, and a stop order
7 is what is needed. Thank you.

8 MR. LARSON: Okay. Our next speaker is
9 Kerby Goforth and Ann Hendrie and Thea Spaeth.

10 MS. KERBY GOFORTH: Well, I felt very brave
11 when I signed up, but I don't feel so brave now,
12 because I have been washed over by the passions, and
13 intelligent remarks. I am a retired school teacher.
14 I taught the last -- I first started teaching in
15 1960, and I finished my teaching career in the
16 Española Valley schools. I taught here for 12 years.

17 What is coming to my mind in all of this
18 was something that I used to talk to my students
19 about, when they would get all excited about things,
20 but they had not a pattern to follow. They didn't
21 have a sequence to follow. They would say, hey,
22 let's do this, and then we would have to kind of step
23 back and take a look at what was happening. And the
24 way that I found best for them to listen and to
25 figure things out was to say, wait a second. In the

1 morning, you put your shoes on first or do you put
2 your socks on first?

3 And it seems to me that this is what has
4 happened here, is that the DOE has set up a situation
5 where they are putting on their shoes first. They
6 haven't put on their socks yet. They haven't
7 finished taking care of the remediation of the
8 environment that they have created before this time,
9 and that's their socks. And then when they go to put
10 on their shoes, then they have to realize it doesn't
11 fit anymore. Those pits, that pit production is not
12 what is needed. That's like putting on seven lead
13 boots, and really what you need is a pair of really
14 good, soft moccasins to walk on this earth here.

15 And I don't think that they have that
16 capacity at this moment, and that's why we are all
17 here, and that's why we have to keep on moving this
18 forward and keep on thinking about our drinking water
19 and thinking about all of the people around us who
20 are not here tonight, and make sure that they get
21 this information as well, so that this goes this way,
22 but it also goes this way.

23 So that's what I call on us all to do.
24 That's putting our socks on, you all. Thank you.

25 MR. LARSON: Thank you.

1 Our next speaker is Ann Hendrie and then
2 Thea Spaeth.

3 MS. ANN HENDRIE: Good evening. I don't
4 think I can follow these wonderful speakers that
5 touched my heart. I want to thank the tireless
6 efforts of those who worked for years to give voice
7 to the ending of this insanity of stockpiling nuclear
8 weapons and making more. And I could name some of
9 them. I think you all know them by now. I also want
10 to acknowledge the thousands of victims of radiation
11 exposure, starting with the Japanese civilians and
12 remembering those who were close to the testing
13 sites, as well as those who have worked at Los Alamos
14 and other nuclear facilities, as well as those people
15 living downstream or downwind from nuclear
16 facilities, and that includes all of us.

17 I have been very struck with the fact that
18 this is a global problem. This is not a local
19 problem, and there is no escape. When there was the
20 Sierra Grande fire -- I live in Ojo Sarco -- and
21 first I thought I would move quickly toward the
22 direction of Santa Fe, but the wind changed direction
23 and it went toward Santa Fe. Besides, I feel this
24 connection to all people in the world, so there is no
25 escape. And I don't want there to be an escape.

1 There is no -- I am here, like all of you
2 in the audience to support a fundamental shift in our
3 thinking, one that embraces all life and does not any
4 longer promote the fear mongering that has been
5 prevalent in this bomb-making culture of ours. I
6 never thought I would live long enough to hear our
7 local politicians and leaders speak up against this
8 insanity, but now it has happened, and my gratitude
9 is much more than I can speak.

10 The world is terrorized by us. Let us now
11 set an example. That has already been said, and to
12 change our direction and to clean up our mess and to
13 care for the land and the air, the water, and each
14 other, with love and peace in our hearts. It is
15 indeed possible. Thank you very much.

16 MR. LARSON: Our last speaker before the
17 break is Thea Spaeth.

18 MS. THEA SPAETH: Hello. My name is Thea
19 Spaeth. I am a mother, a community member, a nursing
20 mother, which we all know that breast milk passes on
21 some contaminants to our children at their very most
22 vulnerable stage. I am also an acequia member,
23 called a parciente, and I am also an acequia board
24 member, and I am speaking here for my own personal
25 views.

1 Like many of the people that have spoken to
2 you today, Mr. Wyka, I started out with a lot of
3 issues about how are we safer? What are the options
4 that you have presented to us? And I have basically
5 narrowed it down to you, Ted, have basically
6 presented Bush's goals and the ways to get to those
7 goals. But I thought we were here to talk about the
8 environmental impact. I will reject all options. I
9 will request a 90 day extension, and during that
10 time, I expect and I demand that the NNSA give us a
11 summary view chart, just like this view chart that
12 you presented today, but in it you tell us, in
13 understandable forms, laymen's speak, that
14 radionuclides will increase by 30 percent in our
15 environment, that the water we use to grow our food,
16 which provides real security, and that the trees we
17 use to heat our homes, grasses we grow to feed our
18 animals, and thus feed ourselves, will become so
19 polluted that we will get sick, sicker, and die of
20 these contaminants.

21 I recently saw a chart of the tested sites,
22 and the dark red zones of the heaviest contaminants
23 stopped cleanly at the Colorado, New Mexico border.
24 This is not because the air and currents travel this
25 way, but because it is not studied or tested.

1 Gosh, there's so much in my thoughts. I
2 believe that you, Ted, as a document manager,
3 understand that if you tell us the ways that our
4 water will be used and that our environment will be
5 contaminated for thousands of years, that the public
6 will outright reject any of these options. I
7 believe, like many of the other people here, that
8 excellence and much of the language in this view
9 chart is meant to confuse and blind us from the truth
10 of the study. Transforming the nuclear weapons
11 stockpile, transforming it to what? Transforming the
12 physical infrastructure to maximize efficiency and
13 minimize costs? Well, I would say they have proven
14 that. Employing the best business practices, what
15 are the best business practices? Are the best
16 business practices to create something that destroys
17 the environment, that is a product of war, that when
18 it's used, what happens to the people when it's used?

19 You talk about the safety of the people
20 around us, best business practices. These have an
21 end result. We are using depleted uranium weapons as
22 bunker busters in countries right now. The land is
23 polluted from the nuclear weapons that were used and
24 tested from the forties, fifties, and sixties.

25 There is no clean-up. When you say clean

1 up, when the Los Alamos new generation scientists
2 talked about clean-up, what does that mean? These
3 toxins are present in our environment because we
4 created them.

5 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

6 MS. SPAETH: The background levels are
7 background since World War II. My grandmother had no
8 background levels. And safety, how is anybody safe?
9 If we want to prove to our allies that we are strong,
10 then we will abide by the anti-proliferation nuclear
11 treaty, that we will deter our enemies by not being
12 threatening. If they have no reason to think we will
13 attack them, that is the safest way we can be. And I
14 thank you for coming here, and I hope and pray that
15 some of the comments here have touched your soul.

16 MR. LARSON: Thank you very much.

17 Well, we are going to take a ten minute
18 break. Before we do, I want to thank -- usually when
19 we break like this, there are people who are going to
20 leave. If you are going to leave, I want to thank
21 you very much for coming, and for those of you who
22 prepared comments for doing so. You are certainly
23 welcome to stay on. Just to give you an idea of
24 where we are, we are halfway through in two hours.
25 It's now 9:22. So we are in it, and as far as I know

1 we can stay here, we will be here until 11:22 if we
2 go at the same pace. Most everybody has been very
3 cooperative in staying within the three minutes, but
4 if we have the same pace, when we are done it will be
5 11:22.

6 Thank you very much for coming. I hope
7 that you will stay. We are going to take a ten
8 minute break and reconvene a little after 9:30. The
9 court reporter needs a break.

10 (A recess was taken.)

11 MR. LARSON: Can I ask you to take your
12 seats, please. Okay. When we get started, we will
13 start as soon as people settle down and sit. The
14 first three speakers will be Shannyn Sellitt, Tom
15 Starke, and Joe Martz.

16 Please, I would like to get started.
17 Please, if you want to carry on your conversations,
18 if you would please do it outside the room. Please.
19 Okay. Any conversations outside the room, please. I
20 want to get started.

21 Thank you. Our first speaker will be
22 Shannyn Sellitt, to be followed by Tom Starke, and
23 Joe Martz. Is Shannyn Sellitt here?

24 MS. SHANNYN SELLITT: You caught me by
25 surprise. Thank you, NNSA, for holding this hearing

1 up here in Española.

2 I'm not a local Españolan, although I did
3 live up here for a few years many years ago, and I am
4 just like amazed sitting in this beautiful chapel,
5 looking at the whole history of the bioregion here
6 and seeing a harmonious culture that was reflected
7 from the past, and it's a question of whether there
8 is a future for this harmonious culture with the new
9 proposed facility up on the hill.

10 I created an idea called the Los Alamos
11 Peace project, which is to transform the laboratories
12 of weapons of mass destruction into institutions that
13 engage only in life-affirming research and
14 development. This is the option that I would like to
15 see the NNSA put in their options for people to
16 choose between, and find out really, if you were to
17 put that option in the NNSA transformation statement,
18 how many people would wholeheartedly come in support
19 of such an idea.

20 We have this concept of the idea of peace
21 and prosperity going together, and I know that from
22 living out here, that it is really difficult, the
23 financial question and the livelihood question, but I
24 hold that the Los Alamos peace project idea, if it
25 were to come to Española, would really bring a sense

1 of awareness of a prosperity to this bioregion,
2 because there are so many really positive things that
3 the lab could be engaging in.

4 I know that the Department of Energy
5 discovered that vegetable oil produced on algae grown
6 on saline water was the highest producing vegetable
7 oil substance. This could completely -- we are
8 surrounded by saline water, this whole country, this
9 whole world. If we were to start growing our fuel in
10 saline water, which would be something that they
11 could research up there at the lab, that, you know,
12 we could turn this whole world around. We could turn
13 this whole situation around.

14 These arguments of the scientists who came
15 to speak in the favor of the transformation, the
16 preferred transformation, because we need nuclear
17 weapons for our national security, well, it turns out
18 that, you know, really the nuclear weapons are
19 working counter to our national security. We have
20 started a war in Iraq. We are currently in a war
21 because of nuclear weapons. We are about to enter
22 another war. Because of nuclear weapons and because
23 of this posture of the Los Alamos laboratory of
24 manufacturing new nuclear weapons and creating a
25 greater field of nuclear weapons, we are putting

1 ourselves in a place where other countries of the
2 world are afraid of us. So, of course, they are
3 going to proliferate nuclear weapons.

4 So instead of this deterrence idea that is
5 as old as like the lab is now, we should be thinking
6 of our deterrents as giving humanitarian aid to
7 people instead of building up our nuclear stockpile.

8 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

9 MS. SELLITT: And when you think of us,
10 that we are in debt of \$7 trillion, people do not
11 have a concept of what a trillion dollars is. Well,
12 if you were to take starting from Christ's birth and
13 spent a million dollars every single day, every
14 single day you spend a million dollars, you would
15 have 250 years more to spend \$1 trillion, and we are
16 \$7 trillion in debt. Where is that coming from? Our
17 children, our grandchildren, our great grandchildren.
18 And I ask the people here in Española, even though
19 they really need the jobs, we know that there are so
20 much better jobs that they could be doing up at the
21 lab. So don't trade jobs today for your children's
22 tomorrow. Thank you.

23 MR. LARSON: Thank you.

24 Our next speaker is Tom Starke and then Joe
25 Martz and Ray Scarpetti.

1 MS. TOM STARKE: Thank you. I also
2 appreciate the opportunity to address this group, and
3 thank the NNSA and City of Española for making this
4 hearing, this meeting possible. My name is Tom
5 Starke. I have worked at the laboratory for 27 years
6 now. I live in Santa Fe County. I appreciate the
7 hospitality being able to come down and address this
8 group.

9 Right now I work in the environmental
10 programs, but I want to speak tonight as a private
11 citizen. I have worked in the weapons program. I am
12 proud of the work that was done in the weapons
13 program, especially through the Cold War. I am proud
14 it wasn't a hot war, and the extent to which I saw
15 governments grow during that period of time, and now
16 we are moving into a period where we are building
17 down the nuclear weapons inventory. I would like to
18 see it go all the way down to zero, and I would like
19 to see it done responsibly.

20 Having started the nuclear weapons world, I
21 think we owe it to the world to build it down in a
22 responsible, knowledgeable way, and that means people
23 who understand, can maintain, and monitor these
24 devices.

25 I also am very close and familiar with the

1 environmental clean-up at Los Alamos. Most of what
2 you have heard about environment tonight is about the
3 clean-up program, and the clean-up program is
4 cleaning up what was done in the Second World War and
5 what was done in the early years of the Cold War for
6 the most part. Los Alamos has greatly improved its
7 environmental and its safety compliance over the last
8 several decades. It operates under Department of
9 Energy, NMED, and EPA permits that are closely
10 monitored by outside people. Furthermore, there are
11 several outside groups that monitor Los Alamos.
12 There is a Citizen's Advisory board, 20, 25 of your
13 fellow citizens who have devoted a huge amount of
14 time to overseeing the clean-up effort at Los Alamos
15 and providing guidance from the public.

16 Los Alamos has also worked very closely
17 with surrounding governments, to provide them with
18 the resources to be able to independently test the
19 potential for radioactive or other contamination in
20 their environments.

21 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

22 MR. STARKE: When we look at this complex
23 transformation, I think it's the improvements that
24 Los Alamos has made, reducing its waste, reducing its
25 emissions, that are going to enable that complex

1 transformation to be accomplished in an
2 environmentally responsible way, and for that reason
3 I support it. And I believe that we can protect the
4 environment, protect the ground water from the
5 complex transformation activities we are talking
6 about, following on the great work that has been done
7 the last many years at Los Alamos, and hopefully as
8 we build down nuclear weapons, we move into an even
9 better future. Thank you very much.

10 MR. LARSON: Thank you.

11 Okay. Our next speaker is Joe Martz, then
12 Ray Scarpetti, and Elberta Honstein.

13 MR. JOE MARTZ: Thank you for the
14 opportunity to speak. I am Joe Martz. I am a
15 plutonium scientist and a nearly life-long New Mexico
16 resident, having grown up here and my entire family
17 is here as well.

18 I support the preferred alternative, and I
19 would like to state why. I find the preferred
20 alternative offers a very progressive set of ideas,
21 which can lead to some common goals which I and many
22 of my colleagues share. To reduce the nuclear
23 weapons stockpile, I would like to see a day when we
24 do not need to rely on nuclear weapons to produce our
25 peace. In fact, I came to the laboratory precisely

1 to help support that goal. My own personal work at
2 the laboratory has involved issues such as weapon
3 dismantlement. I am one of three co-inventors of the
4 process, which removes plutonium from retired pits, a
5 process to date in which we have dismantled over a
6 thousand pits through processes at Los Alamos,
7 removing that plutonium permanently from a weapon
8 configuration, and in many cases converting it into
9 oxide fuels to be burned in reactors to extract the
10 energy and make it proliferation resistant.

11 I was the principal investigator for
12 plutonium aging that resulted in the work that show
13 that pit lifetimes last considerably longer than
14 first seen. That was a piece of science that was
15 begun in 1996. I conceived those initial studies,
16 and it's one reason we are here today. Six years ago
17 the Department of Energy was proposing a modern pit
18 facility, with pit capacities in the hundreds,
19 approaching 4 to 500 per year. My findings, and that
20 of my colleagues, that pits last considerably longer,
21 has allowed that option to come off of the table. I
22 think that's something we can all support.

23 Many people suggested six years ago in
24 hearings, that instead of proposing a modern pit
25 facility, allow the scientists at the laboratory to

1 do their job and to understand plutonium and pit
2 aging. I have done that job. That has allowed us to
3 propose a very modest capacity of pit manufacturing,
4 which will provide a capacity and capability to
5 protect our deterrent. The progressive idea, which
6 is embodied in this preferred alternative, is the
7 idea of a capability-based deterrent. I think that's
8 an idea worthy of support. It suggests that instead
9 of relying upon numbers of weapons in our arsenal, we
10 can remove those weapons from our arsenal, and
11 instead rely upon the capability to produce them,
12 should and if the world situation changes and they
13 should be needed.

14 Given that choice between large numbers of
15 deployed nuclear weapons or drawing down the
16 stockpile and placing more of our security in the
17 capability itself, I prefer the latter. In
18 shorthand, it is more the products of my work, which
19 we no longer rely upon the products of my work to
20 protect our security, but more upon my work itself,
21 and that's a better idea. That's a better idea, as
22 Norris Bradbury used to tell our lab employees years
23 ago.

24 I also support the preferred alternative
25 because of the environmental responsibility. It

1 reduces our nuclear footprint by 50 percent, gets us
2 out of World War II facilities into modern buildings,
3 and dramatically reduces our environmental
4 signatures. I agree with every speaker here, that we
5 should reduce our environmental impacts and clean up
6 the legacies of the Cold War and of World War II. I
7 didn't create this problem, but I am here to help
8 solve it.

9 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

10 MR. MARTZ: I will conclude with a simple
11 statement. The work of myself and my colleagues have
12 led to some trends which are, I think, not widely
13 known. We have reduced the United States' nuclear
14 weapons stockpile by 90 percent, including a
15 75 percent reduction since 1991, with the collapse of
16 the Soviet Union, and a more than 50 percent
17 reduction since the Bush administration took office.
18 These are worthy trends which I admire and support,
19 and they are based in part upon the work of myself
20 and my colleagues at the laboratory. That work
21 should continue. It is supported by the preferred
22 alternative.

23 I am proud to say I work at Los Alamos and
24 I am a nearly life-long resident of New Mexico. I
25 live 7,000 feet downwind from the plutonium facility.

1 I am extremely concerned about the environmental
2 impacts and what might happen. That's why I support
3 this preferred alternative, because it reduces
4 dramatically the transportation and movement of
5 nuclear material, improve the security, and allows me
6 to do my job in a safer, more modern facility. Thank
7 you.

8 MR. LARSON: Thank you, sir.

9 All right. Ray Scarpetti? Is
10 Mr. Scarpetti here? If not, Elberta Honstein? Gene
11 Finch? At this rate we will be through in a minute.
12 Gerry Maestas? Lorrie Bonds Lopez?

13 MS. LORRIE BONDS LOPEZ: Yay, I'm here.

14 MR. LARSON: You will be followed by Mike
15 Burns. Is Mike Burns here? And Richard Cook. Is
16 Mr. Cook here? Mr. Cook is not here. Is Kelly
17 Armstrong here? Is Matthew Ellis here? Okay, you
18 will be the third speaker, sir.

19 MS. LOPEZ: Hi. I am Lorrie Bonds Lopez,
20 and I haven't had this much fun since I voted a few
21 Tuesdays ago. I just think this is fantastic, to
22 have everybody here and have everybody saying what
23 they have to say, and everybody listening, mostly
24 generously, and being willing to hear opinions that
25 are vastly different than whatever your opinion is.

1 I mean, that's really what it's all about. I think
2 in New Mexico we are really good examples of how to
3 do that, because we have had a lot of practice.

4 So let me tell you a little bit about me,
5 so that you will understand the commitments that I am
6 about to speak to you about. I am committed to one
7 world. My name is Lorrie Bonds Lopez. I am married
8 to an Hispanic man. I have two children. My
9 daughter is an environmental scientist. She is a
10 marine biologist for NOAA, and she is working to save
11 monk seals in the northwest Hawaiian Islands. My son
12 is going to spend the summer and fall semester in
13 Beijing studying international relations. So I have
14 invested my children in what I consider having a
15 really great world where everybody understands one
16 another.

17 I also really appreciate that my children
18 never had to do duck and cover drills, and what I do
19 for a profession is I am a mediator, I am a
20 facilitator, I am an ombudsman, and I do outreach and
21 public involvement for environmental programs at the
22 laboratory. And I hope that you didn't just stop
23 listening to me, because I said I work at the
24 laboratory. I really believe in public involvement,
25 and I really, really want all of you to give input

1 into our programs.

2 There has been a lot of misinformation. A
3 lot of it has been promulgated, because for some
4 reason people believe, that if they can stop our
5 environmental clean-up, somehow that will stop
6 nuclear weapons. That is not true. We really need
7 to do the environmental clean-up, and I support the
8 preferred alternative, because I believe that we are
9 reducing our footprint, and we are doing what nuclear
10 weapons were originally designed to do, which is to
11 have a place holder until we can do what we do so
12 well in New Mexico, which is talk to one another and
13 talk to the world.

14 So I appreciate you listening to me with
15 all of your generosity, and I really love that we are
16 all going to live together and work this one out.
17 Thank you.

18 MR. LARSON: Thank you very much.

19 Okay. Mike Burns, and then Matthew Ellis.

20 Is Joanne Baek here?

21 MS. JOANNE BAEK: Yes.

22 MR. LARSON: You are third.

23 Mr. Burns, please.

24 MR. MIKE BURNS: Good evening. My name is
25 Mike Burns. I am a citizen of Los Alamos and have

1 been since about 1969. My wife and I married in Los
2 Alamos. We raised our children in Los Alamos. I am
3 also currently the deputy associate director at the
4 laboratory for what we call threat reduction. That
5 is work that my colleagues and I do associated with
6 trying to reduce the threat of weapons of mass
7 destruction around the world. Prior to doing this
8 job, I was a special assistant to the President in
9 the White House for nuclear defense policy, and I was
10 an inspector in Iraq for the international atomic
11 energy agency.

12 My work with my colleagues and my
13 experiences lead me to support the preferred
14 alternative and wish to see it endorsed in the
15 government's record of decision. I reached that
16 conclusion, because I have devoted my career to
17 topics such as nonproliferation,
18 counter-proliferation, counter-terrorism, nuclear
19 assessment, monitoring response, nuclear forensics,
20 and I believe all of those activities absolutely
21 require a very efficient nuclear weapons complex.

22 The preferred alternative seeks to reduce
23 the footprint of our nuclear weapons complex at Los
24 Alamos, but also makes it more efficient, less
25 impactful. We need the smaller and safer weapons

1 complex, the people and the facility in that complex,
2 to study and handle nuclear material, to train and
3 provide inspectors, for example, to support
4 international nonproliferation, export control, to
5 provide the technologies for verifiable disarmament
6 around the world, to maintain a 24/7 watch for
7 nuclear emergency response capabilities.

8 So, in short, we can't do those things
9 without the people, the personnel, the facilities,
10 and the expertise of the nuclear weapons complex.
11 And even with a 50 percent reduction of the footprint
12 and a 20 percent reduction of its people, as proposed
13 in the preferred alternative, it will still be what
14 we need, a consolidated, smaller, safer, and more
15 secure complex, and it will remain essential for us
16 to meet the non-nuclear weapons national security
17 work that we do at the laboratory as well. Thank you
18 very much.

19 MR. LARSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
20 is Matthew Ellis, then Joanne Baek and Miro
21 Kovacevich.

22 MR. MATTHEW ELLIS: Thank you, everybody,
23 for coming out to this, and also thank you to the
24 NNSA for having this hearing. My name is Matthew
25 Ellis. I am your neighbor from down the road in

1 Santa Fe. And typically I like to respond to these
2 things with well thought out, cogent,
3 intellectualization of the reasons for my argument
4 against it, but tonight I would like to speak from my
5 heart about this.

6 I go to bed every night looking out my
7 bedroom window at Los Alamos. I have a straight
8 shot, a clear, unobstructed view of the lights at
9 night, and I often wonder, you know, what goes on up
10 there. I'm not here tonight to speak for myself. I
11 am here to speak for my son, who is three years old,
12 who can't speak yet. I would like to talk about my
13 spiritual conviction. I believe that at the end of
14 my life, I only have two conscience questions to
15 answer to, two entities of conscience: One is God
16 and the other is my son. And I'm not a
17 prognosticator, please -- I'm not testing your will,
18 Lord -- but I believe what the questions will be:
19 What did you do for the land? And what did you do
20 for peace? I believe that both God and my son will
21 ask me those two questions.

22 With conviction and certainty I can say
23 remaining passive to expanded plutonium production
24 does neither for peace nor the land. Furthermore,
25 concentrating trigger pit production here will taunt

1 our potential adversaries, or terrorists, if there
2 are any, in the world, not only to increase their own
3 arenas of proliferation, but also to declare to the
4 world, hey, Los Alamos is open for a preemptive,
5 first strike target. I don't believe in that.

6 Furthermore, I question who is going to
7 profit from this pit production, the privatized
8 contract holders? If -- if this is such an economic
9 windfall, in my Christian charity, I would like to
10 offer pit production to Alexandria, Virginia or
11 Crawford, Texas. You can have the facility and make
12 all the money you want. God is watching us, and, "El
13 Santo Señor conoce nuestra corazones y nuestra
14 acciones." Thank you.

15 MR. LARSON: Our next speaker is Joanne
16 Baek, or do you pronounce it Joan?

17 MS. JOANNE BAEK: Yes, Joanne Baek.

18 MR. LARSON: And then Miro Kovacevich? If
19 not, is Helen Finch here? Gilbert Sanchez? Oh, Miro
20 Kovacevich. Oh, good, thank you. I'm glad you're
21 here.

22 So after you, Helen Finch is not here.
23 Gilbert Sanchez, okay, you will be the third speaker,
24 sir.

25 Ms. Baek, please.

1 MS. BAEK: Thank you. My name is Joanne
2 Baek. I live north of Taos. I appreciate the
3 opportunity to speak. And with Lorrie, I appreciate
4 all the comments that have been made so far. I wish
5 I was so articulate.

6 I will share a couple concerns, and then I
7 will share my enthusiasms for transformation. One
8 concern I have, is that we are all ordinary people.
9 None of us is so extraordinary that we can safeguard
10 things which are so dangerous as nuclear materials
11 and weapons. We also cannot guarantee that in the
12 future our leaders will always make the right choices
13 or that we the people will always choose the wisest
14 leaders. We cannot guarantee that everyone working
15 at Los Alamos or with weapons will be 100 percent
16 safe 100 percent of the time, nor that they will make
17 the right choices every time.

18 A second concern of mine applies, even if
19 these weapons are not used and if there are no
20 accidents ever. I have heard that birth defects are
21 elevated. I have heard that thousands of nuclear
22 workers have suffered through and died of cancers. I
23 have heard that children in Los Alamos have elevated
24 rates of cancer. The moral foundation of our country
25 is that all persons are created equal and have equal

1 rights to life. The loss of even one life is too
2 much. Those are some of my concerns.

3 Now for my enthusiasms. My enthusiasms and
4 hopes for LANL and the Department of Energy rest in
5 my enthusiasm for creative group process and the
6 capacity of scientists and engineers and other
7 creative and visionary people to solve problems. I
8 would like to see these creative and capable minds
9 engaged in powerful work that is wholly positive and
10 correctly focus on real solutions that will benefit
11 people of this country and create improvements in
12 conditions around the world. I believe this would be
13 a far greater deterrent to aggression and harm by
14 others in the world. If you love your neighbors and
15 your neighbors are helping you with your own creative
16 projects, you don't go out and buy a gun to protect
17 yourself from them.

18 I believe the workforce of LANL and the
19 Department of Energy can make a positive contribution
20 towards peace and international security if they will
21 focus on objectives that meet the needs of all. One
22 of my favorite moments in history is the speech in
23 which President Kennedy says that we will put a man
24 on the moon within a decade. Imagine that, setting
25 out to do the wonderfully impossible and doing it,

1 and we were able to do it, because we had collective
2 vision. We had experts and engineers and the best
3 minds focussed on a beautiful goal.

4 I would love to stand up here and say what
5 the beautiful new vision that LANL and the Department
6 of Energy should work on. I don't yet know what that
7 vision is myself. I feel that we need a new vision.
8 We all need a new vision. We need to be talking
9 about it and creating it. Perhaps it must include,
10 as many suggested, the development of solar and wind
11 technologies that put affordable or free energy
12 production into every person's hands in this country.
13 Also environmental restoration, perhaps, too, it can
14 be the design of absolutely nontoxic, extremely
15 affordable housing construction, so that persons like
16 myself don't go through much of our lives homeless.

17 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

18 MS. BAEK: Taking this high value
19 scientific quest, these could be our own man on the
20 moon type endeavors, for our benefit and for the
21 benefit of the world. I am 100 percent in favor of
22 LANL and Department of Energy undergoing
23 transformation. I would encourage dialogue and
24 visioning to make it a really great transformation,
25 and one really worth bringing into the world. Thank

1 you all.

2 MR. LARSON: Thank you. Thank you very
3 much.

4 Our next speaker is Miro Kovacevich. Did I
5 get that right?

6 MR. MIRO KOVACEVICH: Yes, perfect.

7 MR. LARSON: Gilbert Sanchez will follow,
8 and then Mauricio de Segovia.

9 MR. KOVACEVICH: I was thinking about
10 talking about something different, but this acronym
11 kind of caught my fancy here, SPEIS. Remember that
12 movie, "Spies Like Us," when Dan Aykroyd or Chevy
13 Chase, and how they in the end, Russians and us, kind
14 of solved their differences. But more important, if
15 you take the IES, the Latin word for space, hope. So
16 there is a hope if you take the IES, which is
17 imperialism, out of it.

18 And, you know, it says it's an
19 Environmental Impact Statement, but I think if you
20 don't think it through, this is essentially an
21 existential impact statement. You know, the whole
22 premise for this exercise in shoving it down our
23 throats is essentially predicated on this Reagan-Bush
24 doctrine of extermination of the human race. It is
25 this unipolar, indispensable nation, nuclear cowboys,

1 nuking everybody who doesn't agree with us. And I
2 don't think that the Chinese will behave differently.
3 I don't think the Russians will behave differently.
4 Humans are irredeemably violent, so prudence is in
5 order here.

6 In other words, we cannot unilaterally
7 eliminate our nuclear weapons immediately, but we can
8 make sure that we don't have a doctrine that is an
9 invitation to collective suicide, by others or
10 suicide by ourselves, and particularly, murder of our
11 children and grandchildren.

12 I moved here, and I am hoping my daughter
13 and grandchildren will move here. And really why,
14 why. First, you know, at least diffuse, put it in
15 more places. Don't even advertise where you are
16 putting them. So at any rate, there is more about
17 this, essentially it's insanity and it's immorality
18 and ignorance and irresponsibility, irrational
19 fear -- many i's in this hopeless paradigm. Why not
20 go back at least to either balance of power or
21 mutually assured destruction or how about
22 co-existence or conviviality? There are many other
23 ways.

24 This is the fruit of a poisoned mind, so
25 why shove it down our throats and treat us like we

1 are a bunch of idiots. We are here loving our words
2 and exercising empty semantics and all of that, but
3 the premise from which you guys are doing this, it is
4 absolutely horrendous. The idea you shall nuke
5 anybody who doesn't agree with you is different
6 because you don't know him, because you don't love
7 him, because you don't respect him, because you don't
8 trust him, it is manifestly, manifestly hopeless. So
9 therefore, why would we let hopeless people tell
10 people who have hope, who know how to build
11 civilization of love, how to give alternatives to
12 violence, why would we unilaterally believe that dogs
13 will bark like us and carrion will pass? There is no
14 reason for that. Don't treat us like IQ 60 -- we are
15 obviously less than that if we buy into this --

16 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

17 MR. KOVACEVICH: Well, for this unholy
18 trinity of fear, greed, and stupidity that drives
19 this rapture, you know, unilateral, after we nuke
20 them and everybody else and the children will die,
21 and that is very, very, very Christian. You know, so
22 we propose -- and I happen to be Catholic, by the
23 way, so it's not -- but that's what they are saying.
24 It's not really, truly -- you know, God doesn't like
25 his children to be killed by techno morons, you know.

1 You know, so anyway, you know, what we --
2 we don't want to really consider this complex
3 transformation. How about simple transformation,
4 transformation to solar evolution and revolution of
5 love? Very fast, 85 years. And we have to wait, and
6 it shall be done. New Mexico has what it takes to do
7 it. The only state in the nation, and it shall show
8 the world. This is blue light flight to Española,
9 the total statement to the world, it shall be done.
10 Yes, it shall be done. It shall be done fast, so we
11 don't need this garbage. Thank you.

12 MR. LARSON: Thanks.

13 All right, the next speaker is Gilbert
14 Sanchez. Now, did I check to see if Mr. Mauricio de
15 Segovia is here? Fine. Mike Logghe, okay, you will
16 be the third speaker.

17 Mr. Sanchez, please.

18 MR. GILBERT SANCHEZ: My name is Gilbert
19 Sanchez, Executive Director of Tribal Environmental
20 Watch Alliance. I am also a former governor of the
21 Pueblo San Ildefonso. Today I am speaking as a
22 representative of TEWA, and my comments should not be
23 reflected as that of the Pueblo of San Ildefonso.

24 Where Los Alamos sits, the 50,000 plus
25 acres is sacred space for TEWA pueblo of San

1 Ildefonso and the pueblo people of the Southwest
2 United States, and that should, as such, be respected
3 and protected as mandated by laws. What I am asking
4 for is protection, much like in the way this country
5 is doing with the State of Israel in the same way
6 their religion is being protected and has been since
7 its establishment as a world state after World War
8 II. The land, as I have stated earlier, are the
9 ancestral lands of the TEWA people and the Pueblo of
10 San Ildefonso, and as such is sacred space.

11 Our spaces are as meaningful to us as those
12 places that the citizens of this United States hold
13 in high significance as national monuments and other
14 places of historical significance, which were created
15 outside of any religion, and yet the citizens of this
16 country will not allow building of such a laboratory
17 which will produce weapons of mass destruction and
18 the massive amounts of waste at those locations, even
19 within National Homeland Security and anti-terrorism
20 threats, then why are the citizens of this country
21 standing for destruction of our way of life and wish
22 to continue to create the world's deadliest weapons
23 and components and their byproducts on such sacred
24 space, I ask myself, why does this country, which
25 goes around instilling democracy in others, not

1 practice it here at home and continue with acts of
2 terrorism against us?

3 The total disregard of my people, their
4 lifestyle, their food, and pathways is beyond the
5 moral principles of humanity. When World War II has
6 ended and the provisions of and Executive Order No.
7 9337 and all those other executive orders that you
8 have placed as top secret items in your vault have
9 not been conformed to, but I do not accept this cause
10 today or into the near future until this complex
11 comes in compliance with safety regulations of its
12 own nuclear regulatory commission, the Federal Code
13 of Regulations, the United Nations regulations, and
14 having an international inspection team, with all
15 nuclear capable countries being represented. Let's
16 not be pointing fingers at the world, but be the true
17 leader as this country professes to be by being in
18 compliance.

19 Further -- further, there have been some
20 shortfalls here at Los Alamos National Laboratory
21 that need to be taken care of, and I have stated them
22 in my written presentation. But my main concern is
23 that we are placed, in northern New Mexico, northern
24 New Mexico, the Southwestern region of the United
25 States in harm's way from their one in a million

1 scenario, when they should be working within an
2 objective goal of never having to face the likelihood
3 of a catastrophic situation, one that is going to
4 leave a vast area of this part of the world worthless
5 and useless to humanity.

6 I am further requesting that a moratorium
7 be placed until a true EIS, inclusive of health
8 impact studies, is completed to establish a true
9 baseline of the nuclear weapons industry on our
10 health, especially that of the citizenry of north
11 central New Mexico.

12 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

13 MR. SANCHEZ: With that thirty seconds, I
14 would like to ask for an extension of 90 days or 120
15 days, and sufficient funding from NNSA to be provided
16 to the TEWA people, TEWA communities in northern New
17 Mexico and other pueblos so that we can educate and
18 bring forward this knowledge of what is happening and
19 what is being proposed at Los Alamos National
20 Laboratory, because there is less than ten percent or
21 less than five percent of TEWA people present here
22 today, and where we make up 80 percent of the land
23 base that you are working around and about 40 percent
24 of the population that is here. So I ask and I
25 demand that we get some funding directly to the

1 community organizations so that we can go out and
2 educate these people as to what we are facing.

3 So with that, I thank you, and I hope that
4 there is no more actions, that a moratorium be
5 placed, and that there are no actions until the
6 actual clean-up is done. You have contaminated my
7 sacred space, my religious place, my holy space. I
8 am a member of a pueblo, I am a citizen of this
9 United States, yet you have ignored my homeland
10 security, my national security. Where is that taking
11 me? Thank you.

12 MR. LARSON: Our next speaker is Mauricio
13 de Segovia and then Mike Logghe and Joan Logghe.

14 MR. MAURICIO DE SEGOVIA: My name is
15 Mauricio de Segovia. I am speaking on behalf of
16 myself and from my heart and from my mind, but I am
17 also the assistant director of recruitment at
18 Northern New Mexico College. I speak with youth in
19 the region regularly, daily, weekly, and oftentimes I
20 hear the voices of hopelessness. It's very
21 disturbing to me that I often have to convince young
22 people to pursue a higher education, when they look
23 around and they see the only options for their
24 employment has to be up on the hill, possibly causing
25 more destruction to life throughout the world. It's

1 disturbing to me and it hurts to see that.

2 It hurts to hear a young gentleman or a
3 young man in a classroom, who I am trying to convince
4 to pursue a higher education somewhere, anywhere,
5 somehow, and that young man tells me that, yes, he
6 wants to get a job. He wants to provide for his
7 family. He wants to make money, but he says, I'm
8 going to join the military, because at least I can
9 make money by killing people. What kind of
10 perspective is that? What kind of hope is that?

11 We want to create a vision for the future
12 for these young people, and in doing so, it's all of
13 our work. It's all of our responsibility to provide
14 some sort of home and vision for the future.

15 Now, the current administration has already
16 stated that we are fighting a new kind of war, a war
17 that we have never fought before, a war unlike we
18 have ever been used to, and yet we go and create
19 another war that we know how to fight. When we look
20 around, when we talk about nuclear weapons, weapons
21 of mass destruction, how is it that we are going to
22 fight this supposed war on terrorism when terrorists
23 are illusive, they work in cells, they keep their
24 information to themselves. They don't drive tanks.
25 They don't fly jets. They don't drop bombs. Are we

1 going to use these pits on a cell in New York City?

2 We are fighting a new kind of war, right?

3 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds.

4 MR. DE SEGOVIA: So what I would like to
5 encourage for the future and for a vision is that we
6 promote research that sustains and promotes life,
7 give our young people hope. And thank you for coming
8 out, northern New Mexico, and speaking out, and I
9 appreciate all the time. Thank you.

10 MR. LARSON: Thank you, sir.

11 Our next speaker is Mike Logghe -- you will
12 correct me, I'm sure -- Joan Logghe and Sheena
13 Cameron.

14 MR. MIKE LOGGHE: Thank you. My name is
15 Mike Logghe. I am glad to finally be speaking,
16 because I have started rewriting this a third time.

17 I'll give you a bit of personal history. I
18 grew up in northern Wisconsin, dairy farming. In the
19 late fifties we started dumping milk. They would not
20 let us sell our milk, because strontium 90 was
21 floating over our fields and into our hay, and we had
22 to take the cows off the pastures, because they were
23 eating strontium 90 from the nuclear testing around
24 Las Vegas.

25 I came down here about 35 years ago. I

1 started working in Los Alamos as a contractor. And
2 at that time, my financial life was kind of based on
3 what was happening at the lab budget. Us guys, in
4 planning our contract in life, would watch what was
5 happening in Washington, DC and watching the lab
6 budget, so I had that contact. At that time I worked
7 a lot with lab people, working on their homes, and
8 knowing a lot of people up there. So I understand
9 that situation up there, and I have been up there
10 quite a bit.

11 In '85 I started working at a radiation
12 testing laboratory in Santa Fe, controls for
13 environmental pollution, and an interesting job. I
14 did computers and at the same time I did radiological
15 testing for those guys. Did a lot of testing of
16 various nuclear power facilities in the country.

17 One day five barrels came from the Savannah
18 River project, and we went and started unpacking
19 those. They were big fiber barrels, taking out fruit
20 jars of dirt. Those fruit jars of dirt that they
21 picked up at Savannah River were hot to the touch.
22 At that point I decided to seek other employment, and
23 to work for the state government.

24 In '99, I went up to Los Alamos County and
25 took over. I ran the computer section up there, Los

1 Alamos County for about three years, and was there
2 during the fire, the Sierra Grande fire. What was
3 interesting about the whole situation was, the
4 laboratories went home, a lot of them took undeserved
5 vacations. The county, Los Alamos, we took over the
6 fire situation. The laboratory was gone.

7 At that time, including my own fire
8 department, the local fire departments around the
9 communities had to go up and fight those fires up
10 there, and to me, the heroes were those guys,
11 unknowingly at times, but they had to go into
12 restricted areas and fight fires in very contaminated
13 areas. These guys had no training, no knowledge of
14 what they were getting into.

15 This to me speaks of the incompetencies of
16 the laboratories, to have those kind of situations
17 where this was not planned for, they did not have the
18 facilities to ensure the safety of the people who
19 were going up there to save their butts basically.

20 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

21 MR. LOGGHE: Basically that, that's kind of
22 my point, is this whole, from the late fifties until
23 now is the incompetency of our nuclear programs. And
24 I see, basically in terms of this whole proposal, I
25 see, I guess I could support the concentration of the

1 facilities, but I have not seen any part of this as
2 why we need to continue the pit production. There
3 has been nothing shown that we need to keep doing
4 this, so concentrate the facilities and clean it up.
5 Thank you.

6 MR. LARSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
7 is Joan Logghe. Sheena Cameron, you are here, good.
8 Shel Neymark is the third speaker.

9 MS. JOAN LOGGHE: I am Joan Logghe. I am a
10 poet. I teach at Santa Clara Pueblo, I teach at UNM
11 Los Alamos, I teach all over the place. Do you see
12 the beautiful orange color? It's such a beautiful
13 color in the painting. During the Los Alamos fire,
14 the entire Española Valley was that color. We were
15 breathing orange whatever. I left with my cat and my
16 children for a few days. Michael was up there -- he
17 was up there -- he was up there.

18 One thing I notice as a poet was the
19 language. It's been talked about, but I have to
20 bring it out again -- transformation.
21 Transformation, that means really changing how things
22 are done. The four pillars, that was talked about.
23 The four pillars, man, it's like holy, right?
24 Agile -- agile. Special -- special is my favorite
25 one, because special was talking about plutonium and

1 uranium, and special is a word that Mr. Rodgers is
2 allowed to use, but it shouldn't be used for things
3 that are poisons and toxins, right? Special, I don't
4 want my writing students to say special, even when
5 they're little. Stewardship, I think, you know, I
6 could go on with that. But we are not hoodwinked by
7 this language, and I wanted to just say that.

8 You remember at the beginning, they said
9 there wasn't going to be a meeting here, and now
10 there is a meeting here. I have a story about
11 Española, and I'm sure that some of these gentlemen
12 who have spoken were at this meeting. It was a
13 public meeting over at what we call the Stroke
14 Center. Maybe some of you were there. The
15 scientists spoke. There was a lot of language I
16 didn't understand, but I hung in, because there was
17 going to be small groups after the big presentation.

18 I went to my small group. There was maybe
19 eight or ten people in the small group. They did
20 intros. All the scientists were introduced. The
21 regular people were not asked to say their names or
22 what they did. To me that is a metaphor for a
23 kind -- I don't want to say arrogance, but I don't
24 know how else to say it in my 30 seconds. To not
25 introduce everyone who is in a small group seemed to

1 me an attitude of -- I don't know what to say, but we
2 weren't originally on the schedule for a public
3 hearing. I just wanted to say that.

4 I am glad that we are now. I am glad that
5 our mayor said some really cool things -- green
6 collar, I love that in a mayor. And I started
7 reading about Rocky Flats last night, because I knew
8 I wanted to say something. Rocky Flats, is this
9 going to be like the new Rocky Flats, because I know
10 poets who were arrested at Rocky Flats.

11 Last night we had a little preview meeting
12 with a lot of people from the pueblos, beautiful
13 speakers last night. I feel really so great that
14 Española is organizing, coming together. I want us
15 to continue. We need that 90 days, so that we can
16 tell our friends to write. And if you don't think
17 you are a writer -- yes, 90 days, we have signs -- if
18 you don't think you are a writer, write anyhow. Get
19 your kids to write letters. I wanted to say that.

20 Oh, when I looked up Rocky Flats last
21 night, there was an amazing image. 17,000 people
22 joined hands around the perimeter of Rocky Flats.
23 They were able to join hands and encompass the whole
24 perimeter. I hope we don't have to do that, but we
25 could. We could do stuff like that. If it's

1 smaller, we could do it easier. I don't understand
2 why smaller, why smaller is better, like smaller
3 rattlesnake venom. You know, I don't know -- I don't
4 know. These things just occur to me as a poet. I
5 have 1,700 other things to say but I'll end --

6 MR. LARSON: You have thirty seconds.

7 MS. LOGGHE: You won't get to hear one of
8 my long poems, because I am long-winded, but Yehuda
9 Amichai, the late Israeli poet said, "Don't stop,
10 don't stop. Beat the ploughshares into musical
11 instruments. Anyone who wants to make war will have
12 to turn them into ploughshares first." Thank you.

13 MR. LARSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
14 is Sheena Cameron. Shel Neymark will be next and
15 then Dee Finney will be third, please.

16 MS. SHEENA CAMERON: My name is Sheena
17 Cameron. I have lived for almost 30 years in the
18 Embudo Valley area. Two years ago my brother and I
19 went to a doctor in Chicago, and I had a hair
20 analysis test done, we both did. This top part shows
21 the toxic elements, and the one that's out the
22 furthest is uranium. It's about the 88th percentile.
23 I have no idea. I was shocked. I don't know what's
24 going on here. My brother, who never lived in New
25 Mexico, had about five percent.

1 When I got home, I talked to my doctor, and
2 she said, "Well, you have to find out where this is
3 coming from so you can avoid it." So she recommended
4 a water test.

5 I tested the water at my house. It tested
6 all right. So I went back to the house that I had
7 lived in for about 12 years prior to that. I tested
8 that, and that was okay. I don't know where this
9 came from. I would like to know. I mean, maybe it's
10 our famous background radiation. But, you know, I
11 can't say it came from Los Alamos, but obviously with
12 all this talk about all this background radiation
13 that we do have, why add more?

14 I also work with Multiple Chemical
15 Sensitivities Task Force of New Mexico, which is a
16 group of people that have been chemically injured.
17 For a couple of years, I was driving up to Los Alamos
18 once a month to see a doctor up there, because it
19 just so happened that one of the few doctors that
20 dealt with chemical sensitivities in the state was in
21 Los Alamos. That was because Los Alamos has the
22 largest concentration of people with chemical
23 injuries in the state in a rich white area.

24 And in the late nineties, our group got the
25 health department to include a question, on their

1 annual health questionnaire, to find out the numbers
2 and kinds of demographics of chemically sensitive
3 people and chemically injured people in New Mexico.
4 And surprisingly enough, it turns out that among
5 Hispanics and whites, it was fairly similar numbers,
6 with Hispanics being a little bit higher, Hispanic
7 males in the southern part of the state, probably
8 agricultural workers. But Native Americans were way
9 higher, and I naively thought -- I just remember,
10 like I think it's Molly Ivans that says, "No matter
11 how cynical I get, I can't keep up."

12 But I figured this will be interesting,
13 because they are going to have to check this out and
14 find out why are Native Americans higher. Well, they
15 didn't. Not only didn't they do anything, they
16 didn't even advertise the fact that they had gotten
17 these results.

18 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

19 MS. CAMERON: When somebody else was
20 talking, I was just remembering once when I was in
21 the Los Alamos art center, somebody was saying that
22 down in Sandia, their shop down there, they were
23 selling earrings of the bomb. And I was just
24 shocked. I made some comment. There were two women
25 from Los Alamos in there, and one woman said, "Well,

1 I don't see anything wrong with that."

2 And just as a demonstration of how divided
3 Los Alamos is on this, the other woman had the
4 decency to be extremely embarrassed. Please, we need
5 90 more days.

6 MR. LARSON: Thank you.

7 Shel Neymark, then Dee Finney, and then
8 Greg Nussbaum. Is Greg Nussbaum here? Then is
9 Patricia Pantano here? Sheri Kotowski? Okay,
10 thanks. You will be the third speaker.

11 MS. TERESA JUAREZ: I would like to have
12 one of those spaces.

13 MR. LARSON: Would you sign up at the table
14 in the back there?

15 MS. JUAREZ: They told me I couldn't sign
16 up anymore.

17 MR. LARSON: Okay. I will take you at the
18 end.

19 MR. SHEL NEYMARK: I live in Embudo. We
20 were told tonight that there are 10,000 pits stored
21 at Pantex. The Sandia labs recently did a study that
22 said that triggers do not wear out. We don't need
23 one more pit. We have 10,000 too many. I read an
24 editorial in the New Mexican by Senator Dominici
25 recently, and he sounded very rational, talking about

1 the mission of the Los Alamos lab, very intelligent,
2 well thought out points he made, much like the man on
3 the video tonight and some of the scientists and
4 Mr. Wyka who spoke so rationally and intelligently.

5 In his editorial, Mr. Dominici said it's
6 really comforting to know that the bomb is going to
7 be there if we ever need to use it. Well, I would
8 like to ask all of you people, when would be an
9 appropriate time to use the bomb? A lot of talk
10 tonight has mentioned nuclear deterrent.
11 Unfortunately that is passe. Our government has been
12 promoting building bunker-buster, earth-penetrating
13 nuclear bombs. Those are first strike weapons. They
14 are not nuclear deterrents. Our government has
15 foregone the policy we have had since the Cold War of
16 nuclear deterrence, mutually assured destruction, in
17 favor of first strike weapons.

18 There has been no discussion of this among
19 the public. There has been no discussion of this
20 even in the Congress. This policy has been changed
21 with no democratic input at all.

22 Tonight we have been told that the
23 Environmental Impact Statement is supposed to address
24 the areas of impact. The areas of impact are the
25 entire planet. If we use one of these bunker --

1 well, China right now is deforesting the country to
2 produce cashmere and other things like that for us.
3 The dust from the western China is blowing across,
4 through Beijing, picking up a bunch of the pollutants
5 from there, and blowing over to Seattle, and Seattle
6 has days where they have -- you know, it's bad there
7 from Chinese pollution.

8 If we drop these bunker-buster bombs in
9 Iraq or anywhere else, the dust will go up in the
10 upper atmosphere. It will blow over on us. It will
11 kill us. The environmental impact is everywhere.
12 And I would like to see the impact statements that we
13 were handed out talk about how bombs would affect the
14 whole planet, how they'll kill us as well as our
15 enemies.

16 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

17 MR. NEYMARK: I would also like to see a
18 fifth alternative added, and I want that alternative
19 to be no more bombs being built. We don't need any
20 new bombs.

21 MR. LARSON: The next speaker will be Dee
22 Finney and then Sheri Kotowski. Is there another J.
23 Gilbert Sanchez? No. Leroy Sanchez? Susan Herrera?
24 Todd Heinrichs? Todd, you will be the third speaker.

25 Ms. Finney.

1 MS. DEE FINNEY: My name is Dee Finney. I
2 am a registered nurse. I practice in Taos and in Rio
3 Arriba County. I work for the State of New Mexico,
4 Department of Health. I would respectfully request
5 that this comment period be extended for as long as
6 possible, because many of my patients and their
7 families and my peers in Taos and north of there had
8 no idea about the hearings. I am not sure why, but
9 we really need more hearings for this extremely
10 critical issue.

11 I am horrified that the DOE is proposing to
12 turn LANL into the premiere nuclear weapons lab. I
13 live downwind from the lab, and being in a helping
14 profession, I am alerted to many health issues that
15 can be directly related to radioactive waste. I am
16 seeing many cancers, thyroid problems, developmental
17 and congenital disabilities that can be a direct
18 result of radioactive waste. Take plutonium, one
19 millionth of a gram causes cancer. It's already
20 leaking into the environment by data our community in
21 Embudo Valley has collected for the last five years.

22 New Mexico is America's nuclear heartland.
23 LANL is a huge and dangerous facility. New Mexico
24 has been so abused by extensive nuclear facilities
25 and radioactive contamination that the federal

1 government designated us as a national sacrifice
2 area, meaning that some states have to be polluted
3 for the national good. It is a site of nuclear
4 testing, extensive uranium mining, national nuclear
5 waste repository, and huge military facilities. New
6 Mexico, another wonderful part of the natural world
7 defiled by the nuclear monster.

8 We cannot afford more nuclear weapons of
9 any sort. The majority of our communities want the
10 DOE and defense department to focus on eradicating
11 our current arsenal. As a country, we are
12 experiencing deep economic, social, energy, and
13 environmental crises. We need to focus on saving our
14 planet from human caused poisoning, and we will
15 continue to rise up in opposition to Cold War
16 mentality that seeks to defend our country with
17 unthinkable technology. Thank you.

18 MR. LARSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
19 is Sheri Kotowski. She will be followed by Todd
20 Heinrichs, and then Rebecca Gutierrez. Is Rebecca
21 Gutierrez here?

22 Thank you, please.

23 MS. SHERI KOTOWSKI: My name is Sheri
24 Kotowski. I really want to thank everyone who is
25 still here. I think the last comment that I made at

1 the last -- I think it was called the last complex
2 2030 hearing was that, I really object to these type
3 of hearings in communities that are working
4 communities, where people have children, people have
5 jobs. And it's really -- it's really disrespectful
6 to ask people to come out and spend until 11:00 at
7 night sitting here to comment on billion dollar
8 projects and million dollar document managing.

9 I have been listening to what a lot of
10 people have been saying, and, you know, I have all
11 this stuff that I wrote and hopefully I will have
12 time to say it, but I really want to comment on some
13 things. Like when they talk about the consolidation
14 of the facility, of the nuclear weapons facility, and
15 that the consolidation they are talking about is
16 national, when all the consolidation is going to be
17 coming to Los Alamos and to our backyard. They are
18 consolidating the nationwide project, but they are
19 putting it all here.

20 And I would also like to comment, that in
21 the supplemental SPEIS, that I have heard a couple of
22 people say that they are reducing the impacts. In
23 the supplemental SPEIS, it clearly states that there
24 will be a 28 percent increase in air emissions, which
25 will profoundly affect downwind communities, that

1 also have to breathe the toxic contamination that
2 comes off the 66 year legacy of waste that has not
3 been addressed, that there is a hundred percent
4 increase in toxic waste generated. There is a
5 300 percent increase in transuranic waste when there
6 is already 40,000 55-gallon barrels of waste sitting
7 at Area G under tents that are falling apart on
8 wooden pallets. I would like to mention that is the
9 biggest hazard up at the laboratory.

10 If that place were to go up in flames --
11 and it very nearly did in the Sierra Grande fire of
12 2000 -- there would be an 1,800 REM emission of
13 radioactivity. It takes four REM to kill someone.

14 I would also like to say that they would be
15 increasing the storage facility. There would be six
16 metric tons of plutonium, weapons grade plutonium
17 stored at this one facility. One microgram of
18 plutonium is lethal. And now I don't know how people
19 are saying that the impact is being reduced, because
20 our communities are going to be feeling these
21 impacts, and it's really unfair for you to even dare
22 to put in writing that there will be reduced impacts.

23 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

24 MS. KOTOWSKI: I would also like to comment
25 on the fact that we have been doing environmental

1 monitoring for five years with the Embudo Valley
2 Environmental Monitoring Group. Every little
3 project -- we have very little money to spend on
4 environmental sampling, and every time we do one of
5 our little sampling projects, compared to Los Alamos,
6 we find cesium, strontium, plutonium at the most
7 pristine part of our watershed. We find plutonium,
8 cesium, strontium, americium, all of these toxic
9 poisons in the area where people will be providing
10 water for their communities. There will be a
11 12 percent increase of water usage that will turn
12 into industrial wastewater to be dumped in the
13 canyons that are already highly contaminated, with 37
14 times the human health standard of PCBs.

15 We need a 90 day extension in order to
16 address some of these issues. We need another 90
17 days and another 90 days, because at no point is it
18 acceptable to continue the global contamination. As
19 many people have stated, we are living in a blanket
20 of toxic, radioactive poison, and that should be the
21 first priority that everybody should be thinking of.
22 This is the future. This is not the future I want my
23 children to have or their children or their children.
24 I want health and vitality, and that does not equal
25 expanded operations of plutonium pit production at

1 Los Alamos or anywhere in the world. Thank you.

2 MR. LARSON: Before you get started, some
3 late entries here. This is Todd. Right after Todd
4 will be Rebecca Gutierrez, and Jim Hall. Is Jim Hall
5 here?

6 MS. TERESA JUAREZ: Excuse me. I asked to
7 be after one of them.

8 MR. LARSON: I said I would have you at the
9 end of the list, and I will put you there. What is
10 your name, please?

11 MS. JUAREZ: My name is Teresa Martin. I
12 just want to say something, because I have got to go
13 home.

14 MR. LARSON: Well, wait a minute now.

15 MS. JUAREZ. Wait, wait, wait.

16 MR. LARSON: You wait.

17 MS. JUAREZ: You wait, you wait. You know,
18 we have been dealing with your racist policies for a
19 long, long time. We have been here. Our children
20 are dying in the community.

21 MR. LARSON: Would you like to --

22 MS. JUAREZ: And you are telling me to
23 wait? You wait. No, no, you wait. And you know
24 what, not only that, we have got the highest dropout
25 rate in the whole state. While Los Alamos sits up

1 there with the best educational system, and still you
2 want to come down here and tell us that we are
3 supposed to accept one more thing. Well, you know
4 what, we don't want to accept one more thing. We are
5 not here to ask you. We are here to demand that
6 another extension be given and another extension, so
7 that we can educate our community. As you see, are
8 they here?

9 MR. LARSON: Okay. Thank you.

10 MS. JUAREZ: Because of your racist
11 policies, and we have dealt with your racist policies
12 for generations already.

13 MR. LARSON: Let me go back. Is Jim Hall
14 here, please?

15 MS. JUAREZ: And my name is Teresa Juarez.

16 MR. LARSON: Robert Chavez? Mrs. Chavez.

17 MRS. EMILY CHAVEZ: Yes. And my son Robert
18 will also be speaking afterward.

19 MR. LARSON: Thank you so much. Please.
20 Sorry about the disruption.

21 MR. TODD HEINRICHS: No problem. My name
22 is Todd Heinrichs.

23 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: Interjection.

24 UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: This is the
25 disruption.

1 MR. LARSON: Go ahead, sir.

2 MR. HEINRICHS: My name is Todd Heinrichs.

3 I am a science writer at Los Alamos National
4 Laboratory.

5 MR. LARSON: Wait a minute. I want to make
6 sure that the court reporter can get the words of the
7 testifier, please.

8 Go ahead.

9 MR. HEINRICHS: But I am here speaking
10 tonight as a private citizen. I have read the SPEIS
11 documents, and I am familiar with the DOE, NNSA's
12 plan options for transforming the nuclear weapons
13 complex and preferred alternative. I support the
14 selection of the distributed centers of excellence
15 option as their preferred alternative for the future
16 of the nuclear weapons complex. I believe that this
17 option introduces streamlining and economy, where
18 necessary, to prepare the complex to flexibly support
19 the nation's nuclear weapons deterrent needs into the
20 uncertain future.

21 I would like to point out one deficiency I
22 believe that exists in the preferred alternative
23 before it becomes a Record of Decision. The summary
24 section of the SPEIS document accurately and
25 appropriately points out the positive effects that

1 science initiatives undertaken by the nuclear weapons
2 program has had and will continue to have for other
3 scientific research at Los Alamos, and indeed, across
4 the nation and throughout the general scientific
5 community. The actinide science weapons physics
6 research and the unparalleled advances in computer
7 science, both in the architecture and its
8 applications, involved in the development and use of
9 the Roadrunner supercomputer purely benefitted
10 unclassified, non-weapons research, and would not
11 exist without the needs and funding of the nuclear
12 weapons program.

13 However, what I did not find clearly stated
14 in the SPEIS was that the reverse is also true. Los
15 Alamos National Laboratory is an exceedingly diverse
16 and vibrant scientific community. Indeed, as many in
17 this audience know, until the advent of the national
18 laboratory system in the early eighties, we were
19 known as the Los Alamos Scientific Laboratory. As a
20 matter of fact, this is the primary reason that the
21 laboratory caught my attention and drew me here to
22 begin my career.

23 My first exposure to the laboratory, other
24 than middle school history class section on the
25 Manhattan project, was an issue of Los Alamos science

1 that was in my college library's periodical section
2 back in Michigan. That one issue contained articles
3 on the laboratory's research for the human genome
4 project, metallurgy, materials research, both fuel
5 cell research and composite materials,
6 nonproliferation, and, of course, actinide science.
7 I was struck by that diversity of research
8 initiatives at a place that I had only associated
9 before with nuclear weapons. When it came time for
10 me to undertake a graduate internship, I chose Los
11 Alamos based on this exposure and subsequent inquiry.

12 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

13 MR. HEINRICHS: During my 14 year career as
14 a science writer, I have been witness to and heard
15 tertiary accounts of instances where a methodology, a
16 technique, an apparatus or instrument, or even an
17 idea has been developed for a non-weapons science
18 initiative, and has had an impact on weapons-related
19 programs. These impacts would not have happened had
20 the laboratory not been the diverse scientific
21 community that it is. I believe that it's in the
22 best interests of DOE and NNSA, that the NW programs
23 at Los Alamos continue to exist within the
24 institution's diverse scientific community.

25 What I would like to see contained in the

1 Record of Decision document for complex
2 transformation is a clearly articulated, prominently
3 featured statement of DOE, NNSA's commitment to
4 continue to nurture basic science and other
5 non-weapons research at this national security
6 science laboratory. Thank you.

7 MR. LARSON: Thank you. Rebecca Gutierrez
8 and then Mrs. Chavez to be followed by Robert Chavez.
9 Thank you.

10 MS. REBECCA GUTIERREZ: Hello. My name is
11 Rebecca. I am from the Pueblo of Santa Clara. I
12 would like to say that there is a direct cause and
13 effect for us living in Santa Clara Pueblo, as well
14 as the entire northern New Mexico Indian and Hispanic
15 communities. We are all affected.

16 As a member of Santa Clara Pueblo, I know
17 that we have a unique, beautiful and prayerful
18 culture that exists nowhere else in the world. Our
19 ancestors worked very hard and sacrificed for our
20 pueblo so that we would have a place to call home.
21 We have to continue to respect, honor, and keep our
22 aboriginal homeland environmentally and culturally
23 safe. It is our responsibility, and we will be held
24 accountable by our ancestors, as well as our future
25 generations to come.

1 If we let it go and don't protect it, we
2 will not be a tribe in Santa Clara. We will not be
3 the proud Spanish communities that exist here in
4 northern New Mexico. We will not be the people that
5 enjoy living here in New Mexico. We have a beautiful
6 culture that has sustained all of us over thousands
7 of years, individually, as a tribe, as communities.
8 We need to continue living together in order to
9 continue our traditions in Santa Clara, our dances,
10 our songs, our language, and our way of life in Santa
11 Clara.

12 It is my firm belief that we cannot allow
13 Los Alamos to continue with their new venture. They
14 have not yet even cleaned up the nuclear waste that
15 currently exists. How will we expect them to clean
16 up the new mess that they will create?

17 In the 65 years that the Los Alamos
18 National Laboratory has existed, we have compromised
19 and compromised and compromised. Compromising is no
20 longer acceptable. We need to say no. We cannot --
21 we cannot allow them to continue to contaminate our
22 homeland. We already have health care issues for our
23 native people. The government continues to cut back
24 funding for health care for Native Americans. Even
25 though we have been promised excellent health care,

1 even though we have treaties, how many of those have
2 been honored?

3 It's even like the Iraqi war soldiers
4 coming back, needing medical assistance. You read
5 about it in the Journal every day. They are asking
6 and begging for medical assistance, after they went
7 out there to protect our country. That's pretty sad.
8 It is my worst nightmare that in 20 or 25 years, or
9 sooner, our air, water, and our land will be
10 contaminated due to a government mistake, as what
11 happened with the Sierra Grande fire. The pueblo of
12 Santa Clara's economy was devastated, and our tribal
13 lands and the wildlife that we depend on was
14 destroyed at that time.

15 When and if the government makes another
16 mistake and they condemn our tribal land, the
17 government will tell us we have to move away from our
18 aboriginal homeland. Will the government be
19 responsible for our displacement, for our health and
20 for our medical needs? What will happen to those who
21 choose to stay to protect our kivas and our sacred
22 sites that are here? Where will our children and
23 future generations live? Where will they go? It
24 will be the extinction of our Santa Clara pueblo
25 tribe. It will be a horrible, painful, and sad way

1 of life. It will be a cultural devastation to our
2 pueblo way of life.

3 We need to protect what our ancestors have
4 left for us. They sacrificed so that we could have
5 what we need to sustain our way of life. We need to
6 respect, honor, and protect our homeland, which is
7 really our life. What city or state will accept
8 3,000 of us from Santa Clara, if we are told that we
9 have to leave our pueblo? Where will we go to
10 continue our songs, our dances, our traditions, our
11 language, and our culture? Where will we go?

12 Will we be another Rocky Flats? Will it be
13 another coverup by the US government and its
14 corporate defense contractors committing another
15 Rocky Flats environmental crime? Look at Rocky
16 Flats. It is shut down and in a clean-up mode, which
17 may continue for over 100 years. In the event of a
18 nuclear facility accident, how long will it take for
19 Los Alamos to be cleaned up?

20 It is easy and common for non-native people
21 that work in Los Alamos to move across the country,
22 move next door to strangers, and start a new life.
23 We cannot do that. We have to live together, because
24 that is the only way we can maintain our tribe. That
25 is the only way we can be Native Americans, and we

1 have already had everything taken away from us. How
2 much more compromising are we supposed to do? To the
3 point of extinction is what the government wants.
4 Didn't they try that already before, giving us
5 blankets that were contaminated with diseases.
6 Telling us here, we are helping you. Yeah, right,
7 you know.

8 MR. LARSON: Thirty seconds, please.

9 MS. GUTIERREZ: This is a changing moment
10 in our lives. What do we want for ourselves, our
11 husbands, our wives, our children, our grandchildren,
12 our great grandchildren, and future generations to
13 come. What do we exactly want for ourselves and for
14 them? We are responsible and accountable for what we
15 leave for them. It is worth the fight to ensure we
16 leave them a safe and secure future. Please stop the
17 complex transformation in Los Alamos. I speak on
18 behalf of the surrounding pueblos and communities
19 which will also be affected.

20 These are my concerns for my people here at
21 Santa Clara Pueblo. As a sovereign nation, we cannot
22 allow ourselves to become extinct over another US
23 government mistake. And I also request 120 day
24 extension.

25 MR. LARSON: Thank you. Next we have

1 Mrs. Chavez to be followed by Robert Chavez.

2 Is there anyone else who is here who has
3 not spoken who would like to speak?

4 MS. EMILY CHAVEZ: Hello. My name is Emily
5 Chavez.

6 MR. LARSON: I ask you to step a little
7 closer to the microphone.

8 MS. CHAVEZ: Hello. I am Emily Chavez. I
9 am from the Pueblo of Santa Clara. I married into
10 the Pueblo of San Juan. I am the wife of Robert
11 Chavez, who will be ordained as a deacon in the year
12 2009. I am also studying to be a master catechesis.
13 I also teach catechism in my church. I am also an
14 artist, a potter, a writer, a weaver, a mother of a
15 nursing child and two teenagers. I am also a
16 daughter, a granddaughter, and I am also not stupid.
17 And I do request more than a 90 day extension.

18 I also come from Pue, which is still there.
19 I was taught that my spirits are still here, because
20 I was also taught a story, that when you do bad
21 things, your spirits whisper in your parents' ear and
22 tell on you. Well, quit crapping in my church, or my
23 spirits are going to kick your ass.

24 MR. LARSON: Robert Chavez.

25 MR. ROBERT CHAVEZ: Hello. My name is

1 Robert Chavez. I am from the pueblos of San Juan and
2 Santa Clara, and I am here representing youth. I
3 would like to begin by saying that my grandchildren,
4 if I could have grandchildren, deserve to live the
5 way we live and how we lived a hundred years before.
6 Los Alamos to me is like a cancer, not in me but in
7 our people and on our land. It's time we need to
8 stand together and get that cancer removed. There
9 will always be traces of it there, but at least we
10 could raise our family.

11 Another thing I want to say is, how can you
12 guys put our future generations in jeopardy for just
13 a couple of dollars? When you guys pass on, your
14 children are going to receive that money, and what
15 are our children going to receive? They are going to
16 receive cancer, unclean water, and unclean air.

17 By concluding this, I would like to say,
18 that life is only as good as the water we drink and
19 the air we breathe. Thank you very much. I
20 appreciate it.

21 MR. LARSON: Thank you.

22 MR. CHAVEZ: I would also like to ask for
23 more than 90 days, so we can educate our youth and
24 get them more involved, and another 90 and another
25 90. Thank you.

1 MR. LARSON: Thank you.

2 We have one more speaker. I would just ask
3 you to give your name when you speak at the podium,
4 please.

5 MS. KATHY WAN POVI SANCHEZ: My name is
6 Kathy Wan Povi Sanchez, and I'm going to speak in
7 Tewa first.

8 (Words in Tewa.)

9 MS. SANCHEZ: I'm not going to translate my
10 Tewa, but I think it should have been provided,
11 translation. Monies should have been given so that
12 we could understand, to speak the truth in our
13 hearts. I am also asking for another 90 and another
14 90 day extension, because our Tewa women need to also
15 be heard, because we are the bearers of our pueblo.
16 We, as women, have the reproductive health and
17 rights, and our justice is being violated, and we
18 need to let them be educated in what kind of burdens
19 our future children are going to be bearing.

20 I am also going to submit a written
21 statement from Tewa United, a women's organization,
22 that deals with the environmental impacts of our
23 communities as well as our cultural ways of being. I
24 know we stayed up late tonight to hear everybody, and
25 I am glad I did, because this type of education of

1 the other side of a scientific way of thinking, which
2 was manipulated and taken from us, and disrespected,
3 there needed to be respect laid down for it again.
4 Because the science that was known billions and
5 billions of years ago when the light came and gave us
6 these thoughts, and thoughts are very powerful. So I
7 thank everybody for thinking good ways, and we want
8 to claim back that science, not turn it to sorcery,
9 but turn it to science that will show and share the
10 light. That the light is of love, and that energy
11 cannot be extracted with force to create this
12 imbalance.

13 And because of this imbalance, our world is
14 at risk right now, and we are in that very vortex of
15 change. We need to make it a good change and not
16 have the destructive effects like it's having right
17 now. Until we can get back into our sacred lands up
18 at the lab, that the lab has taken, that right will
19 not be put back in place. We need to have the
20 ability to be in those lands and not consider it a
21 safety risk for our own people to be in there, to
22 right the wrong that has happened a long time ago.

23 I would just like to thank everybody for
24 listening to both sides, and to know that the hearts
25 of people can be changed, and that the lab should not

1 be considered an entity of a person put by itself,
2 because it is for profit and it is, as already
3 stated, it's for producing these weapons that
4 destroy. They are not -- there need to be no more
5 pits, no more radioactive business, no more
6 destruction that will leave us like we were these
7 ancient dinosaurs, because these dinosaurs have had
8 to bear the burden of billions of years of what
9 happened, when things were off balance. And we need
10 to return that balance back within our mind, our
11 hearts, and our spirits.

12 MR. LARSON: Thank you. Thank you very
13 much.

14 And thank you all. Before we break off, I
15 just wanted to thank you, again, for coming tonight.
16 I know there is a lot of passion here that has been
17 expressed very well and by many people. I'm sure it
18 has an impact. As of now, the cutoff date is
19 April 10th. I have to remind you of that.

20 I want to thank, in addition to the folks
21 who came and the people who were here before, I want
22 to thank the city for making this facility available
23 to us. And I really wish we could all thank Sally
24 Peters for four hours of work on the computer.

25 Thank you very much, and this meeting is

1 now adjourned.

2 (The hearing concluded at 11:08 p.m.)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

5 March 27, 2008
6
7
8

9 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

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

15 In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set
16 my hand on April 5, 2008.
17
18
19

20 _____
SALLY PETERS, RPR, CCR #57
License Expires: 12/31/08
21 500 Marquette, NW, Suite 280
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102
22
23
24