

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 2030
SUPPLEMENTAL PROGRAMMATIC
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

DECEMBER 5, 2006
12:50 p.m.
Albuquerque Convention Center
Albuquerque, New Mexico

REPORTED BY: Mary Abernathy Seal, RDR, CRR, CCR 69
Bean & Associates, Inc.
Professional Court Reporting Service
500 Marquette, Northwest, Suite 280
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102

(2496A) MAS

1 MR. LAWSON: Okay, folks. We're getting
2 ready to begin, if you could take your seats,

3 please. If you'll bear with me for just a minute or
4 two, I have to read a few words into the record.

5 Welcome back. I will now read into the
6 record for verbatim transcription my introductory
7 remarks for the public comment meeting. This
8 portion of our meeting is officially designated as
9 the Albuquerque, New Mexico, public meeting for the
10 National Nuclear Security Administration's
11 supplemental PEIS for the Complex 2030 program.
12 This meeting is being held on December 5, 2006, in
13 the Albuquerque Convention Center. It is being held
14 to receive comments on the scope of the programmatic
15 EIS.

16 We are commencing the public comment
17 portion of this meeting at 12:45 p.m. and are
18 scheduled to adjourn once all participants have had
19 a chance to make their comments. Each speaker will
20 have a maximum of five minutes. This meeting was
21 preceded by a presentation by NNSA's PEIS document
22 manager, Mr. Ted Wyka. Mr. Wyka will represent NNSA
23 in listening to and accepting your comments.

24 For the record, my name is Barry Lawson,
25 of Barry Lawson Associates. I have been asked by

3

1 NNSA to conduct this comment period as an
2 independent and neutral moderator. I'll ensure that
3 the ground rules reviewed earlier are followed, and
4 this approach is in keeping with both the letter and
5 the spirit of the National Environmental Policy Act.

6 The court reporter today is Mary Seal.
7 Her task is to create a complete and accurate

8 transcription of this meeting. The verbatim
9 transcript of oral comments received will be
10 included in NNSA's record of these proceedings.
11 They will place copies of the transcript from this
12 and other public meetings in its Freedom of
13 Information Act designated reading rooms as soon as
14 practicable.

15 If you want to make oral comments today,
16 you must have first signed up at the registration
17 table, and I will recognize speakers in the order in
18 which they have registered. I would ask you to
19 please remain in this room if you are scheduled to
20 speak. I will be calling two speakers at a time,
21 both the current speaker and the person who's on
22 deck, so that you'll have some warning before you
23 are to speak. When it is your turn, please come
24 forward to this podium over here to my left. This
25 will help the court reporter make an accurate record

4

1 of your comments. If you are approaching the time
2 limit, I will as gracefully as possible give you
3 some signal to try to summarize your remaining
4 comments as gracefully yet as quickly as possible.

5 It's also my discretion to call for a
6 break or recess in the proceedings if necessary, to
7 give the court reporter or others a breather.

8 Commenters are recommended to state their
9 names for the court reporter's record. If you have
10 a written copy of your testimony or if you have a
11 written document that you would like to submit as an

12 additional exhibit, please bring it to me after you
13 have spoken. Written comments will be formally
14 accepted into the record as exhibits to this meeting
15 in addition to the oral comments, and as mentioned
16 several times earlier, each is weighed equally by
17 the administration.

18 Now, also just before we get started, if
19 we do have a break, if there's anybody who feels
20 that they might be intimidated by speaking in front
21 of a larger group and would like to speak in private
22 with the court reporter, we can make provisions for
23 that when we have a recess or at the end of the
24 session. So if you need to do that, just let me
25 know, when we have a break.

5

1 Okay. We're ready to go. Our first
2 speaker will be Geraldine Amato, and she will be
3 followed by Ellen Robinson.

4 MS. AMATO: You defray parking tickets? I
5 really needed to leave earlier, but -- I can see
6 that with the presentation here that we, the people,
7 don't have any direct control on whether the project
8 goes forward or not, so I don't think my comments
9 will do much, even in the final document. But I
10 would like to, if I'm allowed -- are you going to
11 tell me when my time is up?

12 MR. LAWSON: If you like.

13 MS. AMATO: I'd appreciate it. Today we
14 have, I argue, an unlawful central government in
15 Washington, D.C. By law, under the principles of
16 the republic, the president and Congress do not have

17 the lawful authority to make these decisions. The
18 will of the people -- we're supposed to be going
19 upwards, from the local upward to the agency and the
20 federal government. Today we have a central
21 government which bosses the people around, and we
22 get to give comments that only affect minor issues
23 in the balance of power.

24 So my argument is that we look at history
25 here, we're in the right place at the right time in

6

1 New Mexico, and I'm speaking to even the employees
2 of the federal government, and the contractors that
3 deal with the federal government. We have a history
4 here. They call the Trinity Site down there in
5 Alamogordo "ground zero" and if you look at what
6 occurred with the numbers and the dates, we have
7 people in high places in this country who are
8 practicing ancient rituals that were prevalent in
9 ancient Egypt and ancient Babylon. And I can't go
10 through the whole explanation of it here. It's not
11 my belief system; it's theirs. But if you look at
12 the numbers and what occurred at the Trinity Site
13 and the three bombs, if you ask what the reason was
14 for naming that site the Trinity Site, you get a
15 bogus explanation, that Oppenheimer was reading a
16 poem, and I forget the name of the poem. There was
17 a reference in there about three gods or something.
18 I forget exactly what it was.

19 But those who decided -- it wasn't the
20 good people of this state. Those who decided to

21 detonate that first bomb at the Trinity Site knew
22 there were going to be three bombs. That's why they
23 named it the Trinity Site, and they marked it with
24 an ancient symbol of sun worship, the obelisk or the
25 elongated pyramid. It was a ritual, some kind of

7

1 ancient -- what they practice in ancient Babylon,
2 and it had significance to them. I don't know what
3 the whole story is.

4 But that site is under the 33rd degree
5 northern latitude on the globe. The date, July 16,
6 1945, you get the numerical value to July, it adds
7 up to 33.

8 The second bomb was dropped on Hiroshima
9 on August 6, 1945. That adds up to 33. And then
10 three days later, the third bomb was dropped on
11 Nagasaki.

12 That was a war crime, but it's never
13 discussed as one. It was the 33rd president of the
14 United States, Truman -- he was also a 33rd degree
15 Mason. And the places on the globe also --
16 Hiroshima and Nagasaki are on the 33rd degree
17 northern latitude on the globe. This is
18 numerology -- how do they call it -- numerological
19 divination. That's their practice.

20 And we see that also in the 9/11 event.
21 The Pentagon is the lawful command of our military,
22 and ground-breaking was on September 11, 1941, as in
23 September 11, 2001. And there's 111 days left to
24 the year at September 11 on our calendar. And we're
25 coming up with 111th Congress. Beware the ides of

1 the 111th Congress.

2 There's numerological mysticism and
3 numerological divination involved with this. Human
4 sacrifice rituals. And those two cities in Japan
5 had large numbers of Christian Japanese in those, so
6 they're mocking the Christian Trinity, and then
7 there's three gods out in ancient Egypt, Osiris,
8 Isis, and something else -- I forget the other one's
9 name. They're also referencing the gods of the
10 ancient Egyptians, those three.

11 And they named the international space
12 station, I'm told -- NASA and those guys referenced
13 that station as Isis, the name of one of the
14 Egyptian gods.

15 Is all this mere coincidence? I don't
16 think so. The Pentagon itself, with all the
17 fives -- the symbol of numerological 5 is for the
18 ancient war god, Mars. Mars is the red planet. The
19 red represents the war of -- I mean the blood of
20 war. And I mean, I can't really go through all this
21 in five minutes, but what I want to just emphasize
22 to you, there's a lot more under the surface than
23 meets the eye.

24 And we, the people, here in New Mexico --
25 they say, you know, it started here, let's end it

1 here. But what it's going to take is the good
2 people of this state to rise up against unlawful

3 authority in government and to restore control of
4 government at the local level to the people, and
5 then move up and out. If we look at what the design
6 of lawful government was with the establishment of
7 the republic, it was the will of the people
8 controlling the courts, law enforcement, and
9 legislative authority at the local level, and then
10 moving up.

11 We have essentially corporations at the
12 local level. Our government has been incorporated.
13 We are under a corporate state, both at the local
14 level -- we have the municipal corporation, which is
15 the City of Albuquerque, the subsidiaries of the
16 unlawful federal corporate state of Washington, D.C.

17 MR. LAWSON: Your five minutes are up.

18 MS. AMATO: Thank you, and good evening.
19 You don't defer parking tickets. I hope I didn't
20 get one.

21 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
22 will be Ellen Robinson, and she will be followed by
23 Camille Kiegel.

24 (The Raging Grannies took the floor: Ellen
25 Robinson, Camille Kiegel, Marcy Matasick, Ruth Imber,

10

1 Dorie Bunting, Sally-Alice Thompson, Caroline Hilton,
2 Elizabeth McMaster, Floy Barrett, Enid Williams,
3 Susan Rodriguez.)

4 MS. KIEGEL: Our message is much simpler.
5 (Singing.)

6 Oh, dear, where does our money go?

7 Oh, dear, where does our money go?

NNSA open mtg 120506

8 Oh, dear, where does our money go?
9 Nuclear weapons and war.
10 We wanted a school and a lot of good
11 teachers.
12 We needed a health plan with national
13 features.
14 A lovely green planet with peace for all
15 creatures.
16 Not nuclear weapons and war.
17 Oh, dear, where does our money go?
18 Oh, dear, where does our money go?
19 Oh, dear, where does our money go?
20 Nuclear weapons and war.
21 We hate paying taxes, but know that we
22 oughta.
23 We'd gladly shell out for some clean air
24 and water.
25 But why must we pay for destruction and

11

1 slaughter?
2 For nuclear weapons and war.
3 Oh, dear, where does our money go?
4 Oh, dear, where does our money go?
5 Oh, dear, where does our money go?
6 Nuclear weapons and war.
7 (Applause.)
8 With nuclear warheads our future's at
9 stake.
10 There's no place to hide, there's no place
11 that's safe.

12 As women we know someone's got to clean
13 up.

14 And that's why we say, stop making this
15 stuff.

16 Oh, stop making this stuff.

17 With hills of mine tailings and water
18 pollution.

19 For nuclear waste, there is no solution.

20 By making more bombs we're just making
21 more hate.

22 So we say no nukes, for our
23 grandchildren's sake.

24 Oh, for our grandchildren's sake.

25 They say that we need to replace the old

12

1 nukes.

2 Build bigger and better and uglier nukes.

3 But we know they're liars, there's too
4 much at stake.

5 So we say no nukes, for our
6 grandchildren's sakes.

7 Oh, for our grandchildren's sake.

8 (Applause.)

9 MR. LAWSON: People often ask me why I
10 enjoy this kind of work. Thank you very much. I
11 have been told that Camille Kiegel, who is the next
12 speaker, is deferring her time to the next person,
13 who is Marcy.

14 MS. MATASICK: And I was the one just up
15 there, too, so I'm deferring.

16 MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Okay,

17 then next speaker will be Joe Garza. And he will be
18 followed by Lily Otto. Is Joe Garza here? Oh,
19 great.

20 MR. GARZA: I don't have a song.

21 MR. LAWSON: Sit down.

22 MR. GARZA: Well, my comments actually
23 refer -- sorry, I'm getting over the flu. Oh, my
24 name is Joe Garza. I'm a proud member of the Peace
25 Center, and I also work with CARD. So basically, my

13

1 comments are directed specifically to facility 2030,
2 the idea of it. You know, this new facility is
3 going to cost a lot of money. A lot. And you know,
4 I think everybody in this room, government officials
5 and also just public citizens, are totally in favor
6 of reducing our nuclear stockpile, especially the
7 legacy weapons. But really, that's already
8 happening at the Pantex company and can continue to
9 be done there without the need for building 2030.
10 Yeah. So that could be done there.

11 Also, one of the other things that the
12 2030 PDF on the Internet said is that 2030 would be
13 good for consolidating operations. But that could
14 be done at Pantex, as you mentioned earlier, sir,
15 without a need for spending lots of money on 2030.

16 The second thing I took from the PDF file
17 on the Internet -- there are a lot of terms used
18 there like enterprise management, risk management,
19 making the whole process more responsive,
20 integrated, and interdependent, but all these things

21 can be done internally, within the existing
22 structure. Another term for that is called good
23 management. You know, we don't need to build a new
24 building to have all these things done.

25 Let's see. Also, the whole concept of

14

1 developing reliable replacement warheads. One of
2 the things that the 2030 PDF document said is, you
3 know, it will be less stringent, and that's a good
4 idea, but you know, if you look up the term, the
5 denotation for less stringent -- that could be less
6 safe. And I don't mean less safe in the sense that,
7 you know, an atomic bomb will blow up. I mean less
8 safe, possibly environmentally. And you know,
9 that's something to be considered, because the DOE
10 has had a bad record of environmental abuse, and I
11 know that DOE says, "Oh, no, we've got it right now,
12 we're really going to take care," and blah, blah,
13 blah. They said that in the past, too.

14 So we just want to make sure that
15 presently they're going to continue to clean up
16 their messes and make no new messes, and also stop
17 interfering with the other government departments
18 that keep an eye on the environment and safety. So
19 that's not anything that -- well, that's actually
20 truly something that the Department of Energy can
21 try to stop doing. Try to stop interfering with
22 these beneficial government agencies.

23 Let's see. I guess that's about all I had
24 to say. I really don't think the whole concept of
25 2030 is necessary, and I know that all of the

1 employees will never say that, because their job is,
2 you know, to go ahead with this. But who I'm
3 speaking to here are just the private -- the public
4 citizens. It's important for you to influence as
5 many people as possible, including members of the
6 government, to vote against this. This is going to
7 be hard here in New Mexico, because Richardson and
8 Domenici are like in bed with the Department of
9 Energy and I don't think Domenici's ever heard of a
10 bomb he didn't like. I you know, he's never heard
11 of a Department of Defense contract that he didn't
12 love. So it's going to make it hard for us, but we
13 need to keep pressure on the government to vote
14 against this.

15 And lastly, as you all know, the checkbook
16 in the United States is not bottomless, and I think,
17 you know, we have more pressing domestic issues,
18 such as health care. The amount we spend here in
19 New Mexico on Medicaid is like this. Okay? The
20 amount we spend on defense is like -- I'm sorry, my
21 arms don't stretch that far. You know? It's a
22 waste of money.

23 Also we need to spend more money on
24 education. And I don't mean basic education, just
25 that. But we need to ensure our technological edge,

1 you know, on the world stage.

2 Lastly, we need to do more research on

3 finding further -- I'm sorry. We need to do more
4 research on reliable energy sources, you know,
5 because a lot of our messes right now, especially
6 like in the Middle East, are like due to our
7 dependence on foreign oil, and also our president's
8 family, you know, made a lot of money on that. So
9 we need to wean ourselves off of this, and try to
10 pursue more benevolent, more benevolent -- more
11 benevolent issues for our limited national budget.

12 Anyway, I guess that's about all I have to
13 say. Thank you so much to the public itself, and
14 thank you also to the government, to the government
15 workers for being here to answer some of our
16 questions. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

17 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
18 will be Lilly Otto, and she will be followed by
19 Susan Rodriguez.

20 MS. OTTO: I am Lilly Otto, and actually,
21 the grannies said it better than what I have to say.
22 They said it in a poetic way. And according to what
23 you said, what we are saying here won't really make
24 any difference in the end. It's Congress and the
25 president who decide whether these things go

17

1 forward. But I want to just appeal to the basic
2 premises of this whole thing. We are pretending
3 that it's all right to do this. And I would like to
4 say it is not. It's not all right for our national
5 defense, it's not all right for anything. We have
6 seen what these weapons do. And what we have now,
7 they are 30 times as strong as what we put down in

8 Nagasaki and Hiroshima. So just what are we going
9 to destroy with them? How many millions of people
10 are we going to kill? And how much land are we
11 going to make completely unusable with these
12 weapons? How can you even consider building them?
13 Where are you going to use them? Drop them on Iran?
14 On North Korea? On Iraq? How many millions of
15 those people are you going to eliminate? And why do
16 they deserve it and we don't? They build one
17 weapon, and all hell broke loose, breaks loose. And
18 we want to build 14,000 more? Is this what it means
19 to be an American? (Applause.)

20 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Thank you. Our
21 next speaker is Susan Rodriguez, and she'll be
22 followed by Shrayas Jathar.

23 MS. RODRIGUEZ: My name is Susan
24 Schottland Rodriguez. I married a man from South
25 America. He came to the United States and he got a

18

1 Ph.D. I also have a degree from Syracuse. I have a
2 child, and she is hopefully graduating from our
3 public schools system that is awful. It's a mess.
4 And that's why I don't work full-time. I make sure
5 that she gets through high school with more than
6 decent grades and she is going to go to college and
7 she will continue her education. That's where our
8 money should go, not into Sandia National Labs or to
9 Los Alamos.

10 I have always been against nuclear
11 weapons. I grew up in New York, as you can hear

12 from my accent. It's not a South American accent.
13 It's a New York accent. I lived here for 20 years.
14 And I was appalled last night when I heard Paul
15 Robinson say that the air quality over there by
16 Sandia Labs -- they have been contaminating the
17 area. It hasn't been monitored. I don't
18 understand. My next call will be to the City of
19 Albuquerque to find out what's going on. They have
20 been dumping. There are mixed waste dumps over
21 there which is close to an area that we plan to
22 build a housing project -- what is that called --
23 the Mesa del Sol in the year 2040, and when the
24 Realtors found out about it, they got really upset.
25 So I don't know where that's been.

19

1 This contamination for these weapons,
2 aside from the whole philosophical political idea of
3 having weapons -- like my friend Lilly says, what
4 the heck do we think we're doing? I mean, we know
5 what these weapons can do. We're no longer
6 experimenting like we did in Hiroshima to see what
7 could happen or threatening people. That's over.
8 We know what they can do, and the cat is out of the
9 bag. Mr. Ali over there in Pakistan went around
10 selling it all over the place. So we should
11 seriously consider disarmament and not building
12 better bombs.

13 There is a JASON study which even Senator
14 Bingaman has taken note of that says that these
15 weapons are not going to last 20 years. They're as
16 much as 100 years. So you know, there's a lot of

17 lies going on here. Our money is not being spent
18 for the people. We are not seriously trying to
19 figure out how do we deal with our enemies. We
20 can't go over there and bomb them like we are in
21 this war over there. We all know it's a lie. The
22 point of that I don't really understand, unless it
23 makes more money for the war industry.

24 This is very, very sad. I don't know how
25 to try to bring up my child to be an honest person.

20

1 This is just complete dishonesty. And the killing
2 and the death that's gone on, using the depleted
3 uranium, the land in Iraq -- I don't know what that
4 means, when you put those kind of bombs on the
5 country. We know what happened to Vietnam. I think
6 we should spend a lot more time in thinking about
7 how do we deal with our people we don't like, people
8 we don't agree with? How do we deal with hunger and
9 poverty, lack of education? As human beings we're
10 really poor on that score. Building more weapons
11 makes you guys a lot of money, make you feel
12 important, but you should really think about this.
13 I'm a Unitarian, and we have a lot of Unitarians who
14 say, "Oh, we don't make bombs over there at Sandia
15 National Laboratories." The first thing they say to
16 us.

17 The child who I brought home from the --
18 my daughter's in the Albuquerque Music Orchestra.
19 His father lives down the block, and he told his
20 kid, "I just design weapons." Excuse me. You make

21 them. We are lying to our kids. Designing
22 something is planning in the future. You're going
23 to make it. And he makes probably more money than
24 my husband does, and he has a degree in national
25 resources and remote sensing, and he philosophically

21

1 would never work in a laboratory like that, and he
2 could probably make more than twice as much as he's
3 making at the State Engineer's Office.

4 So this is a moral and philosophical thing
5 we ought to look at. What do we do about reducing
6 the stockpile, stopping nuclear weapons in terms of
7 teaching children and teaching our young people at
8 the universities? How do we think about peace? How
9 do we talk to people. When we don't like our
10 neighbor I not going to throw a rock or drop a bomb
11 on them. No, you can't do that. And this world is
12 too dangerous. We really ought to seriously think
13 about peace. There's a Carnegie Institute for Peace
14 and we've heard a lot of these people on Charlie
15 Rose. I mean, we really ought to expand our social
16 values, our social education, and work for peace.

17 That's all I have to say. Thank you.

18 (Applause.)

19 MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. The
20 next speaker is Shrayas Jathar, followed by Emil
21 Shaw. Is Emil Shaw here? He will be followed by
22 Rosamund Evans.

23 MR. SHAW: Thank you. My name is Emil
24 Shaw. I'm the chair of New Mexico -- Friends of
25 People for Weekly World. I'd like to commend the

1 National Security Administration for holding these
2 hearings. Because of the process, we can review a
3 policy that's been operating in the United States
4 for over 50 years, a policy of nuclear deterrence.

5 These hearings are important because they
6 impact not only on the international
7 nonproliferation treaty, but also the future
8 economic development of the state and the impact
9 that this nuclear production would have on
10 agriculture, the water, and the whole ecosystem.

11 The main argument for the pit production,
12 aside from the serious questions that it needed
13 replacement, is that it acts as a nuclear deterrent.
14 I would argue that the fact that the United States
15 is the only major producer of the atomic weapon, is
16 the only country to unleash this weapon on other
17 peoples, proves that nuclear production is more of a
18 tool of international terror than deterrent. To
19 argue that we have not had a nuclear war is to argue
20 more for the sanity of the world to come together
21 through the United Nations and search for a peaceful
22 solution of the problems of the world than to prove
23 the efficacy of mutual assured destruction. It's
24 the same as to say as long as we're not dead, we're
25 still alive.

1 Now, the whole concept of MAD is mad.
2 Where there is a nuclear -- if there's a nuclear

3 exchange, no one in the world is safe. Whole
4 nations will disappear. And despite the statements
5 of overbloated corporate managers and some generals
6 that some of us would survive, the prospect of a
7 20-year nuclear winter is not something that anyone
8 could understand, unless they witness the horrors of
9 war in Iraq and Afghanistan, where innocent
10 populations have suffered for years the destruction
11 and deprivation of decent living conditions.

12 To date, there has scientific evaluation
13 of the present plutonium pits and observations were
14 made that the present supply of pits has still the
15 capacity to kill for the next 80 to 100 years.
16 Hopefully by then the peoples of the world and the
17 United States will have come to a better method of
18 resolving conflicts than holding atomic destruction
19 over each other's heads.

20 Congressman Tom Udall, Senator Jeff
21 Bingaman, and even Senator Peter Domenici have
22 expressed serious doubts as to the necessity of
23 rebuilding these pits. Added to this has been the
24 concern of Los Alamos in their testing lab and now a
25 production facility.

24

1 A few years ago there was a forest fire in
2 Los Alamos that caused nuclear contamination of the
3 soil at the disposal grounds being subject to
4 washouts from winter snows and threat to contaminate
5 the surrounding soils of agricultural communities
6 near the lab. How much more contamination would
7 there be, not only of Los Alamos but also the people

8 as far away as Pojoaque and Santa Fe, if there would
9 be full-scale production as Los Alamos?

10 Rather than discuss the feasibility of
11 more nuclear production, it would be a major step
12 forward for this commission to begin the process of
13 scientific conversion of military production to
14 peaceful uses. The same facilities that are now
15 used to threaten the whole world with negative
16 consequences could also be used to enrich the world
17 with scientific developments that could benefit all
18 of humankind.

19 Sandia Labs has already led the way in
20 small-scale developments such as a finger clamp that
21 measures human oxygen consumption, and water
22 purification devices that can be used under
23 primitive outdoor conditions. No one has yet begun
24 to evaluate and plan for the use of mountain rains
25 for water conservation. No one has yet begun to

25

1 plan for the conversion of the bases threatened by
2 closure to be converted for peaceful uses, such as
3 fueling stops for national airlines. No one has yet
4 made a serious estimate as to how many good-paying
5 jobs could be created by such a plan of conversion
6 of military destruction to peaceful development.

7 Within the past six to eight years I have
8 observed the people of the state working at two
9 levels: One, individuals that have jobs with either
10 the government, both the military and civilian
11 capacity, and thereby enjoying a fairly comfortable

12 living. And the other population work at minimum,
13 subminimum, wage, both industry and agriculture,
14 that, in turn, has negative effects on the social
15 well-being of the whole population. The low
16 rankings in education, the high rankings in crime
17 and social aberrations can be attributed to this
18 tremendous lack of economic opportunity for at least
19 half of the population. By making a step in the
20 direction of peaceful conversion, this commission
21 could begin to help the people of the state improve
22 their lives. Thank you very much. (Applause.)
23 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Shaw. Our
24 next speaker is Rosamund Evans, and she will be
25 followed by Terry Riley.

26

1 MS. EVANS: My name is Rosamund Evans. I
2 could be here for Gray Panthers, which has
3 nationally called for disarmament. I could be here
4 for Grandmothers for Peace, which is an
5 international organization calling for disarmament,
6 nuclear disarmament. But I'm going to today enter
7 as the Green Party. The state --

8 MR. LAWSON: Could I ask you to let go of
9 that?

10 MS. EVANS: Yes. I'm jiggling it. I'm
11 sorry.

12 MR. LAWSON: That's okay.

13 MS. EVANS: We will be submitting for the
14 New Mexico Green Party written documents and Green
15 Party members will be testifying at the Los Alamos
16 and the Santa Fe meetings. We call for nuclear

17 disarmament, and we oppose in every way possible the
18 proposed expansion of the nuclear weapons
19 production, and we'll work in support of the other
20 members of the community in New Mexico and across
21 the country, and internationally who abhor this
22 violation of the nuclear weapons proliferation
23 treaty which the US has promised to abide by.

24 And it doesn't matter that if we say we
25 hear from all of you that this is not -- and I heard

27

1 this also at the University, at the symposium on the
2 reliable replaceable warheads -- this is a
3 violation. The people before me have spoken quite
4 eloquently, including wonderfully the Raging
5 Grannies, who have put into words a lot of my
6 feelings.

7 It seems that these hearings follow a
8 pattern where the public is asked to come, but we
9 really have no decision-making nor any assurance
10 that we're really going to affect the decision.
11 We're told ahead of time that you folks working on
12 it really don't have the say. Well, it's time for a
13 lot of us to have a say. For 60 years, we've been
14 spending billions and billions and billions,
15 probably to the trillions by now, easily, on these
16 weapons. We're told, "We're not going to use them.
17 They're deterrents, and that's why we have to have
18 them."

19 Well, if there was ever anything more
20 absurd, instead of doing the things that the world

21 needs, health care around the world, how much more
22 loved and respected and how much safer would we be
23 if we put trillions into health care around the
24 world? How much would we in New Mexico benefit?
25 The only health studies that have been done on the

28

1 environment, as I understand it, are at Los Alamos,
2 but those of us, as someone has said before, all
3 over the state, we have these very damaging effects
4 of what has been going on in our state for 60 years.
5 We have grave concern about water, both groundwater
6 and what's happening in the land and what the rain
7 and the snow washes in. We have grave concerns
8 about having land to grow food, and across the
9 world.

10 And it's very conveniently -- this is
11 really what I find over and over in these
12 hearings -- there's a very convenient separation of
13 the small part that each of you are working on. You
14 can easily go to sleep at night or take care of your
15 children, because you didn't work on genocide today.
16 You didn't really work on destroying the planet
17 today. You were really doing a very well-paid,
18 careful job of scientific import to your career.

19 Now, I respect the scientific community,
20 but we need to put the efforts in a different
21 direction, so that we can all really say we did work
22 for the health of the planet today. And you can't
23 just say it's this small part, the research grant at
24 the University has nothing to do with nuclear
25 weapons. They will say, "We don't do weapons

1 research." That's what they tell us. We have
2 destroyed indigenous communities around the world.
3 Did you remember that today? We have destroyed
4 indigenous communities and others around the world
5 with testing and fallout, so we can't do that
6 anymore, but we are going to test these weapons and
7 the trajectory that is needed to evaluate in the
8 ocean. That came out in the hearings that we held
9 at the University.

10 Now, some you may shake your heads and
11 say, "Oh, no, that's not it." But these will be
12 going on, as I understand it, submarines -- after
13 all, they're going to be flexible and more usable.
14 So they will need to be tested as to where they're
15 going to land when they're on ships, and so on.

16 It's time for us to just -- we have to.
17 There's no other way, and some of you have said it
18 very beautifully. But the entire world is at stake.
19 The cancers, the health -- you know, we're asked
20 here to comment really on the environmental impacts.
21 We can't do that. There's no way any of us can do
22 that, or that you can do that. The precautionary
23 principles needs to be applied here, and now if you
24 can't prove that it's safe, you don't do it. The
25 burden is on you, not on the public trying to be

1 informed as much as those of you who work every day
2 on this. We do our best to be informed and to be

3 ahead of what we might do to protest, but you're
4 always technologically doing a snow job. We can't.
5 And it's very overwhelming. I felt that again
6 today, of what can you say, how can you do this? We
7 can't address it all. So the first thing is a
8 mistake.

9 We're wasting tens of billions of dollars.
10 This new complex you say is going to make us safer
11 and it's going to make all of this be better. We
12 shouldn't be doing it. The radioactive waste is not
13 addressed here. We have it in New Mexico, but the
14 amount of waste that's being generated by this
15 project won't even fit in WIPP. Maybe one year's
16 worth, as I understand it. We need to consider
17 that. I wish the labs would clean up and put their
18 efforts into cleaning up the messes as best we can,
19 that we've already put across the world, including
20 the depleted uranium and some of these things that
21 are destroying our growing land for millions of
22 years.

23 We need to become a center for other ways
24 of developing energy, and I think that the labs
25 could do a beautiful job of that. So let's all be

31

1 more human in the way we approach this, and separate
2 it out from the technological as best we can. Thank
3 you. (Applause.)

4 MR. LAWSON: Thank you very much. Our
5 next speaker is Terry Riley, and he will be followed
6 by Janet Greenwald.

7 MR. RILEY: Thank you very much. My name

8 is Terry Riley. I'm representing Democracy for
9 New Mexico, and Veterans for Peace, and about a
10 dozen other organizations.

11 I listened to the presentation, and I,
12 too, was frustrated by the typical -- not to pick on
13 you particularly -- the typical presentation from
14 DOE, because I have listened to a few of those
15 before. It comes down to the impression that we in
16 the audience have -- me particularly I can speak
17 for -- is "Don't bother your pretty little head.
18 We're the ones that know what's going on. You just
19 go back home and we'll take care of everything."

20 And I'd like to point out, you have done a
21 really shitty job. Okay? And several people before
22 me have pointed out some of the pollution that's
23 been created and very briefly alluded to some of the
24 health risks to some of the people who were exposed
25 by some of the work, some of the places where

32

1 nuclear weapons were developed, designed, built,
2 tested. It's amazing, if you start looking at the
3 number of people who have been affected in our
4 country by the work we have been doing in nuclear
5 weapons. The good that we have done through nuclear
6 weapons is imaginary at best. The good that nuclear
7 energy has done is very easily debatable that it is
8 offset by the amount of damage that nuclear energy
9 has done. We have problems, and we have a fantastic
10 scientific community that is spending all of their
11 time and energy on nuclear weapons. We have needs

12 for energy independence, renewable resources, and as
13 long as we keep spending our time paying our
14 scientists to go out and make a better way to blow
15 somebody up, what we have is a waste, because we can
16 solve things. We've put men on the moon. We've
17 sent people to space. And we've made some amazing
18 bombs.

19 Well, what if we took this and put it to
20 solving real problems, really eliminating hunger,
21 improving education, in our country, providing
22 enough money in our country that we could respond in
23 something like Katrina, which -- can you imagine?
24 Can you remember when it happened? You know that a
25 very large percentage of those people who were

33

1 displaced are still displaced? Because our
2 government is spending money playing with the wrong
3 toys. All right?

4 We're looking at new toys. I taught my
5 children, "You don't play with a new toy until you
6 put away the old toys." Made my life a lot easier
7 as a single father at the end of the day, going in
8 and putting the kids to bed. I didn't have to wade
9 through anything. I put my kids to bed. I'm sure I
10 picked up a few things, but basically, they put away
11 what they played with.

12 Well, to the DOE, you haven't even cleaned
13 the mess up, much less the toys you were playing
14 with. Okay? Before you get anything new, fix the
15 old stuff. Put it away, discard what is bad. Those
16 are the things, messages, that are really important.

17 One of the things in the early part of the
18 presentation on the benefit of this --
19 consolidation. Safer. Easier to protect. If you
20 want to believe the fear-mongers that are running
21 our government right now, we're under dire threat,
22 risk of nuclear bombs being smuggled in and doing
23 vast destruction to our country. If indeed that's
24 real and we have to be able to respond militarily,
25 if you consolidate good enough, they can take us out

34

1 in one hit, damn it. Okay? What do you want? Do
2 you want safety, or do you want consolidation? It's
3 a word game you're playing with our money. Safety
4 is dispersal. We're taking our nuclear weapons
5 technology and doing like we did in Pearl Harbor.
6 Does anybody remember the pictures of the airplanes
7 lined up, wing tip to wing tip? The Japanese didn't
8 have to aim. Well, if you believe in the mystical
9 terrorist who's going to carry a 7,000 pound-nuclear
10 warhead on his back as he hikes across the Mexican
11 border, then you have to know that that guy is going
12 to make it right up to Los Alamos, he's going to do
13 one heck of a lot of damage.

14 We've got to do things to make things
15 safer without making them -- not with stupid plans,
16 okay? People who make plans because it helps keep
17 them employed -- yes, I'm looking at you -- make
18 plans that are different. Think outside the box.
19 Come up with a change. Tell your leader, your
20 manager, "This is stupid." Risk your job. All you

21 could gain is your life and your children's future.
22 It could be a good thing to do.
23 I would really like to leave it at that.
24 Think about what you do. Find a way to channel it
25 to something that is really doing something good

35

1 without any rationalization. And if the jobs aren't
2 out there, then I guess it's time to make the job.
3 There are those of us who have given up on the
4 business sector and gone into doing work on our own.
5 It can be done. Private entrepreneurs are what
6 really make this country. Thank you very much.
7 (Applause.)

8 MR. LAWSON: Thank you, Mr. Riley. Thank
9 you.

10 Our next speaker is Janet Greenwald.
11 Janet Greenwald here? Okay. And Ms. Greenwald will
12 be followed by Stephanie Hiller.

13 MS. GREENWALD: Thank you for this
14 opportunity to speak. I am a coordinator of
15 Citizens for Alternatives to Radioactive Dumping,
16 and I also work with the Albuquerque Center for
17 Peace and Justice.

18 There are two labs in New Mexico, Los
19 Alamos National Laboratory -- two major labs -- and
20 Sandia National Laboratory. We know that after the
21 Los Alamos fire, through tests done by Los Alamos,
22 that produce was contaminated in the downwind
23 communities from Los Alamos. Americium was found in
24 broccoli and then recently in plums. That area
25 where it was found, the Embudo Valley, is one of the

1 bread baskets of New Mexico. A lot of our produce
2 comes from that area for the whole state.

3 The Anna Casey Foundation and a limited
4 survey done by CARD along the eastern part of the
5 United States of our state, New Mexico, shows that
6 our children are in trouble healthwise and we don't
7 know why. But young children are having more
8 incidents, for instance, of cancer than they were
9 before 2001. There has never been a health survey
10 of any of the communities downwind from the major
11 nuclear facilities. The only health survey that's
12 been done with the production of nuclear weapons and
13 the possible contamination from their making has
14 been done in Los Alamos, where four times the rate
15 of thyroid cancer was found. Thyroid cancer is like
16 the canary cancer among cancers related to nuclear
17 contamination.

18 My family has a farm downwind from
19 Los Alamos, and that is the community in New Mexico
20 that I am most familiar with. Since the Los Alamos
21 fire, three of my friends have gotten cancer, two
22 breast cancer and one leukemia. One of them has
23 died. All of these people ate largely out of their
24 gardens, and had a mostly vegetarian diet. This is
25 anecdotal, I know, but I want to share this

1 anecdotal information with you.

2 My daughter-in-law is now pregnant. She's

3 in her fifth month. She was pregnant with twins.
4 She lost one of the twins. Twins run in both sides
5 of my family. This is the first miscarriage that we
6 know of on both sides of our family. She now has
7 some trouble. There's trouble with her umbilical
8 cord, of the baby. As an almost-grandmother,
9 instead of experiencing the full joy that I should
10 be experiencing, my days are plagued with worry,
11 calls about doctors' appointments, calls about
12 imaging of the baby's heartbeat and the baby's
13 umbilical cord.

14 Right after the Los Alamos fire, a number
15 of people in that area reported strange behavior of
16 animals, deaths of newly born animals. Usually if
17 an animal is going to die after they're born, they
18 won't suckle. That's the usual pattern. There's
19 something wrong with the animal and they won't
20 suckle, or the mother won't suckle the animal. But
21 these animals had the strange pattern of suckling
22 and then, a few days after suckling, dying.

23 You have talked about environmental
24 justice, that that's going to be considered when you
25 talk about increasing bomb production because that's

38

1 what 2030 is about, 125 certified pits per year, 200
2 pits per year because not all of them can be
3 certified, because they won't be perfect enough.
4 We're talking about increasing pit production.

5 A CARD member overheard some employees of
6 Los Alamos saying that they needed the 2030 project
7 because they need to make smaller, more usable

8 nukes, so that terrorists coming up from Mexico
9 won't have to carry that heavy bomb. He can just
10 put it in his suitcase.

11 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: Or she.

12 MS. GREENWALD: Or she. Right. CARD
13 believes that before any new nuclear projects or
14 acceleration of nuclear projects occurs in our
15 state, that there must be two studies done of the
16 population surrounding the laboratory or the place
17 where this happens. And that is a disparate impact
18 study and a health study of the surrounding
19 population. Disparate impact would look at, are
20 these populations already experiencing accelerated
21 cancer rates, accelerated disability rates? Are
22 they a minority part of minority groups? What is
23 their poverty level? Are they able to take care of
24 problems, health problems, once they have them?

25 Our other laboratory, Sandia National

39

1 Labs -- it's right here in the city. It
2 manufactures 90 percent of the nuclear bomb
3 components at this time. The Peace Center has been
4 conducting a study over the last four years
5 concerning the labs. Those reports are now
6 finished, and what they show is that Sandia's
7 releasing more radionuclides than is allowed by the
8 Clean Air Act. And also Sandia National Labs is the
9 only major facility in the bomb class complex that
10 has no federal air monitoring at all. The only
11 facility. And this is a facility in the middle of a

12 population of over half a million people.

13 About six years ago, I spent half my day
14 taking care of young children and then half my day
15 working on nuclear issues, and I was trying to
16 decide where to put my energy, one place or the
17 other, because I no longer had the energy to do
18 both. And that year, at my little day care center
19 of 37 children, there was a little boy who was four
20 years old who was dying from a malignant brain
21 tumor. He had a little backpack that he carried
22 around so that he could squeeze a bulb and inject
23 pain medication into his body so he could keep going
24 to school or play basketball or whatever he was
25 doing.

40

1 At that same time, a child of two years
2 old was admitted into my class with leukemia. She
3 had no hair and she cried all the time, and
4 eventually had to be withdrawn from the school.

5 So I'm trying to combine a little
6 anecdotal information with the actual facts. And
7 what the facts show is that the Department of Energy
8 is not taking care of the people that are
9 surrounding their facility, and before they move
10 forward with making one more pit at Los Alamos,
11 making any more bomb components at Sandia, they need
12 to do the health studies and the disparate impact
13 studies that should have been done long, long ago
14 when this process first began. Thank you very much.
15 (Applause.)

16 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker

17 is Stephanie Hiller, and she would be followed by
18 William Gross.

19 MS. HILLER: Thank you very much. I
20 appreciate the opportunity for us to speak about
21 your plans. My name is Stephanie Hiller, and I'm
22 the founder of a small organization called Women for
23 a Better World. And it could be called A Better
24 World for Women, because a world that is safe for
25 women would be safe for everybody. But that's not

41

1 the world that we're living in today. We live in a
2 world where women are very unsafe, children are not
3 safe, and men are not safe, either.

4 I'm getting very confused as the
5 proceedings go on, and so I'll try to be brief,
6 since I'm confused. You're telling us that you're
7 reducing the number of nuclear weapons, or that you
8 propose to reduce them and you have reduced them
9 already. And that should be something we would all
10 support enthusiastically, and want to join you in
11 your intention. And yet nobody is happy with what
12 you're telling us, and so it seems that we just
13 don't believe you. There's a real credibility gap
14 here.

15 We aren't hearing our president telling
16 the world how much he wants to end the threat of
17 nuclear war. Instead, we hear him defend his war in
18 Iraq, where hundreds of tons of radioactive
19 materials have already been dropped in the form of
20 depleted uranium. We don't hear him talking about

21 the dangers of nuclear weapons. Instead, we hear of
22 war plans to use nuclear weapons against Iran. And
23 yes again, we hear you saying that because of the
24 president's nuclear posture review, which sounded to
25 most of us like a very bad thing, you're reducing

42

1 nuclear weapons.

2 So what's happening here? We hear that
3 the Pentagon wants to put nuclear weapons in space
4 in order to rule the planet by dominating outer
5 space, that that's what's necessary in the brave new
6 world we have entered into. And yet, you are
7 telling us that you are only interested in
8 maintaining a safe, credible, deterrent nuclear
9 arsenal and that you are following the protocol to
10 reduce nuclear weapons, which, again, we would all
11 applaud.

12 It seems to me that nuclear weapons are
13 the worst thing that's ever happened to America, for
14 one thing, because ever since we started building
15 bombs, our government started systematically lying
16 to us. And it's just become normal now for the
17 government to lie, so we accuse you of lying even if
18 you may be telling the truth. And it's really a
19 pathetic state of affairs and I think this burden of
20 nuclear weapons, of which we now have many, is also
21 causing you some stress and pain, and all I can say
22 is, it seems to me that this attitude of maintaining
23 peace by having more strength, more weapons, and
24 more power of a weapons type is the only way to
25 create peace. It seems to me that it's this whole

1 way of thinking that needs to change. We would be
2 much more effective in the world right now if we
3 were assuring the world that we mean no harm, if
4 indeed we were seeking ways to unravel the terrible,
5 terrible devastation in Iraq and getting out of
6 there, and if we were actively promoting a peace
7 agenda in the world.

8 I think that terrorism would lose its fire
9 if we would stop threatening people and start
10 proposing ways to bring the world together to solve
11 the really pressing problems that we face, such as
12 global warming, water shortages, and water
13 pollution, and miles and miles and miles of
14 contamination from nuclear waste, as well as a host
15 of diseases beginning with cancer and migrating into
16 many new diseases which we don't know anything about
17 dealing with many, many chronic syndromes and
18 children's health being impacted, signs of mental
19 disorders, increasing things like autism and
20 schizophrenia, learning disabilities, and so on, as
21 well as cancers and leukemias. Many diseases may
22 have a relationship to radiation which is
23 synergistic with the overwhelming chemical pollution
24 we suffer. So we have a lot of big global problems,
25 and what I would like to hear you say is that you

1 want to reduce nuclear weapons and you want to
2 convert technology and money to making the world a

3 livable place where we could be confident that our
4 grandchildren would survive. Thank you.

5 (Applause.)

6 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
7 is William Gross, and he will be followed by Senator
8 Shannon Robinson. Is the senator here? Not
9 supposed to be here quite yet. Then Phyllis Hoge.
10 You'll be next. Mr. Gross, please.

11 MR. GROSS: Thank you, and thank you for
12 the opportunity to be here. I have been in a number
13 of countries, and there are few that would provide
14 an opportunity to hear and present a wide range of
15 opinion.

16 Because of my experience in industry a
17 number of years as a corporate officer and
18 considering potential new products, I couldn't help
19 but think of a parallel. And that is, if there's to
20 be a new product or system produced, one of the
21 first things necessary is to know that there is a
22 market for it that would be worthwhile, and that it
23 isn't worth proceeding unless there is. The
24 parallel here is the need, and there is an assertion
25 that this is necessary for national security. Now,

45

1 I do read a good deal, but I have not found
2 convincing evidence in that regard. So that's
3 nervousness.

4 Secondly, any new activity needs to have a
5 cost-effectiveness, and that means that we need to
6 look at the positives and at the negatives and to
7 have enough more positives than the negatives to

8 make it worthwhile to proceed.

9 Thirdly is the experience the boards have,
10 that often the total cost far exceeds what was
11 initially assessed. And so for these areas, I raise
12 questions and do believe that this program of giving
13 people an opportunity to express their concerns is
14 very essential for a healthy democratic country.
15 And I look forward to getting a better understanding
16 of just how this could be helpful with respect to
17 national security, and I think, too, we need to look
18 at the pluses and the minuses of that. Thank you.
19 (Applause.)

20 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Okay. Phyllis
21 Hoge, and then followed by Sonya Bernschneider
22 Benson.

23 MS. HOGGE: I wish you could sit down. I
24 remember walking around in art exhibits, and it's
25 the most wearing thing I know.

46

1 MR. LAWSON: Well, I did it for four hours
2 last night, I'm going to do it four hours tonight,
3 and I'm going to do it for eight hours tomorrow. If
4 I'm still standing at 10:00 tomorrow night, I will
5 be surprised.

6 MS. HOGGE: My name is Phyllis Hoge. I'm a
7 poet, and I quote when I say, "Poetry makes nothing
8 happen."

9 Alternative option 3, if this is all
10 that's available to us, appears to me to be the most
11 preferable. Nevertheless, I stand against the

12 research and development of what is called Complex
13 2030, and most strongly oppose the funding of any
14 more nuclear weapons of any sort, or the
15 refurbishment of stockpiled weapons. Besides this
16 expense, I cannot understand their use, what their
17 use, God forbid, could be. Underlying all of this
18 is the environmental impact in many areas since the
19 danger continues.

20 Since this is so, how come a facility is
21 already being built in Los Alamos if, as I
22 overheard, this is true? Defense. The fact that we
23 have more weapons right now, as well as a few years
24 ago, did not deter the attacks of 9/11 and could not
25 deter them tomorrow.

47

1 Deterrence. The big stick we shake around
2 to show how strong we are. Is that a threat? My
3 bombs are bigger than your bombs? Everyone in the
4 world already knows that. And I thought we had
5 agreed to honor the nonproliferation treaty. Yes?
6 Are we not to be trusted to keep our word? USA, the
7 powerful liar? The world already looks upon us not
8 with the respect and trust that we were accorded in
9 the past, but with fear and suspicion, neither of
10 which is a motivation for peace and friendship
11 across international borders.

12 The cost. Are we already too far into
13 debt to add any more to the billions that could be
14 better spent to offer our own country -- men, women,
15 and children -- what they need in health, education,
16 and safety?

17 Domestic matters to raise up those who are
18 poor and hungry. Sufficient unto the day is the
19 evil thereof. How about the good to be sufficient
20 unto the entire future of the world? I'm very glad
21 to be here, and I appreciate hearing Mr. Wyka's
22 presentation. It helps me at the very least to get
23 a feel for what is happening way apart from where I
24 might be able to make a difference. The only real
25 alternative to fixing the stockpile is to get rid of

48

1 it entirely. (Applause.)

2 MR. LAWSON: The next speaker is Sonya
3 Bernschneider Benson, who will be followed by Mark
4 Benson.

5 MS. BERNSCHNEIDER BENSON: Hi. From my
6 understanding, the mission from Los Alamos -- what
7 they want to put there is to create more warheads.
8 And after listening to everybody speak, I don't
9 think I'm saying anything new. It's pretty
10 unanimous that the question is: How necessary is it
11 to create more? And then there's the redundant
12 question of the plutonium life span. I think like
13 it's lasting pretty long, maybe even longer than the
14 experts thought. That's something new to think
15 about. And perhaps being flexible and wise people,
16 maybe there's a different way that hasn't been
17 thought about that goes beyond Complex 2030.

18 Then there's the question that the numbers
19 of nuclear warheads in existence seems more than
20 adequate, and with that being the case, maybe being

21 wise and really intelligent people that we do have
22 working for this, seeing how things can -- if you're
23 too stubborn and too set on one way, maybe there are
24 different ways like that could save us a lot of
25 money to take what we already have and to get

49

1 probably what is wanted. I think that most people
2 here would think that no more war is wanted. In
3 fact, a lot less is wanted. The policy from the
4 government seems to be to decrease warheads. So it
5 just seems to be really logical to take what we
6 already have and get everything that everyone wants,
7 which is less, and at the same time to have a
8 feeling of safety, if that really is to be had
9 through nuclear warheads. It seems like we have
10 that, we have enough.

11 And then when it comes to money being
12 spent, when it comes to creating more bombs, maybe
13 that in Los Alamos we could have the money spent
14 creating renewable energy, which is -- because one
15 of the draws, I think, that Los Alamos could look
16 forward to is more jobs. Well, what about having
17 those jobs for renewable energy, which is very
18 popular? I'm trying to buy PV panels. It's not all
19 that easy or cheap, because it's a really hot thing
20 if you want to make something. And it creates jobs.

21 While I have doubts that Complex 2030 is
22 necessary at all, I have no doubts that I do not
23 want it in Los Alamos. I am here to grow
24 organically. I am here to build organically. I'm
25 here to have my own babies, and I do not want

1 something that could further pollute my drinking
2 water. I can see Los Alamos at night and I can see
3 Sandia Labs, and that's scarier than I thought until
4 today.

5 I am against the inherent risk of having a
6 large nuclear plant so near to myself. I know
7 that's selfish. I don't want them at all. But I
8 would fight very hard and encourage my friends to
9 speak out against having something so near to us
10 that could potentially be so dangerous. And it
11 seems to me that there are perhaps enough current
12 negative environmental health consequences to the
13 citizens around here of Espanola as a result of the
14 labs of Los Alamos and people downwind, downstream.
15 I think that might be us.

16 And doesn't it make sense to address and
17 solve these environmental and health problems before
18 embarking on more? So I would like my voice to be
19 heard. I have grown up with the idea that if I
20 speak loud enough and long enough, that I will be
21 heard, as long as I'm not being crazy. And so I'm
22 pretty sure I'm not, and I will keep speaking and
23 encouraging others to speak out against Complex
24 2030. Thank you very much. (Applause.)

25 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker

1 is Mark Benson, to be followed by David McCoy.

2 MR. BENSON: My name is Mark Benson. I

3 just moved here in April. I don't have a lot of
4 facts or information behind me, we just found out
5 about this yesterday, but I felt it was really
6 important to come out here today and to have my
7 voice heard. Some of the questions I have are: Who
8 decides what is a sufficient quantity of nukes? You
9 know, is it the people, or is it the administration?
10 And how much is enough? You know, I think most
11 people here today have said that zero is probably
12 enough. I agree with that wholeheartedly.

13 Is it the right message to bring a gun to
14 a peace conference, is what I feel like we do, that
15 we're professing that we want peace in the world,
16 and yet we continue to build up our armament and is
17 that correct?

18 They stated the weapons stockpile is
19 getting smaller, but is that hidden behind the fact
20 that maybe the weapons are more strong than they
21 have ever been? I don't understand that, either.

22 How many of you people are selling your
23 souls, you know? I think money has become such a
24 huge issue, such an addictive thing for people
25 that -- how many people really don't look at that?

52

1 They don't think about what they're actually doing
2 to the environment or to people, you know? Who is
3 exploring the environmental impact, and what is
4 their agenda? Is it the wolf in the sheep's
5 clothing watching the flock, i.e., the EPA? I don't
6 know that I trust these reports that come out
7 because it seems generally that it's the agenda of

8 whoever is paying for the report and they're going
9 to get their point across.

10 My grandmother lived in Page, Arizona,
11 which is in northern Arizona, and it's right on the
12 border. She moved there in the early '60s, and a
13 lot of her friends that were there in the late '50s,
14 when they did all the testing in Nevada, died from
15 cancer. Straight across the border. Everyone she
16 knew got cancer that lived in that area at that
17 time. And there's no way to prove that that was
18 because of the nuclear testing, but it's definitely
19 something to look at.

20 I also know growing up in Phoenix, that a
21 Motorola plant in Merrivale -- that they had a lot
22 of hazardous materials that they were storing, and
23 they kept saying nothing was happening, there was no
24 leaking of the groundwater. But the leukemia rate
25 of children in that area was hundreds and hundreds

53

1 of times above the norm. So I think that there are
2 definitely a lot of things to look at and things
3 that we ignore. Some of my concerns are that this
4 administration continually puts their puppets in
5 charge of the agencies that are supposed to
6 objectively monitor and check the government, and I
7 think that's not going to stop.

8 I think in the recent past that we are
9 choosing money over human life, you know? I think
10 that the almighty dollar is more important than what
11 may be happening to us as human beings. I think

12 that the government has always felt that it knows
13 best about what it's doing, but I think we can look
14 back 60 years to when they were testing the nuclear
15 bombs and having soldiers sit out -- right in there
16 just so that they would get -- to see what would
17 happen to them. And so I think every time we think
18 we know what's best right now, and so we could be
19 saying that right now, we know exactly what we're
20 doing, we know what's best, and then 20 years down
21 the line, when people are dying, we're going to say,
22 "Well, maybe we didn't know what was best."

23 So I think now is the time to really enact
24 changes to do something about that.

25 I don't trust that safety breaches will be

54

1 made to the public. You know, some other people
2 have said here today, if something happens, what's
3 the air quality? Are we really knowing about that?
4 Is the paper telling us anything? You know, what's
5 the groundwater like? I mean, I don't think we hear
6 about that at all, because it's the big money agenda
7 again. They don't want to us know that, you know,
8 it's Bush's kind of thing to dumb down America, and
9 so there's in dumbing down of New Mexico.

10 I think any way that we look at it, we are
11 poisoning our environment. There's just no way
12 around that. And maybe 2030 actually stands for the
13 year that there will be an irreversible catastrophic
14 accident if we stay in this path that we're on. I
15 think if these things are so important, I think that
16 maybe we should store the plutonium on the Crawford

17 ranch. (Applause.)

18 Finally, my prayer is that we will shift
19 away from a swaggering, egotistical hypocritical
20 bully to a country that lives from its heart, holds
21 itself accountable, and pursues the betterment of
22 humanity and not the almighty dollar. (Applause.)

23 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
24 is David McCoy, and he will be followed by Tom
25 Lockwood.

55

1 MR. McCOY: Hello. My name is David
2 McCoy. I'm the director for Citizen Action
3 New Mexico. We've been involved in monitoring the
4 mixed waste landfill at the Sandia Laboratories. We
5 are also concerned with Sandia's role in the
6 production of nuclear weapons.

7 Do you all remember the nuclear posture
8 review? I'll review it for you. (Laughter.) That
9 was a weekly exercise that I had to make as a child.
10 They'd ring a bell and I'd get down in that position
11 and think to myself, now, who would want to do that?
12 And you always had to make sure your butt was turned
13 to the window because you didn't want to get hit in
14 the face from the flying glass from the nuclear
15 bomb. They made sure of that. So that's the kind
16 of anxiety that, you know, we put a whole generation
17 through with these kind of things.

18 And then later on I found out what we put
19 generations through in Japan with Hiroshima and
20 Nagasaki. You know, these people look at these

21 scoping hearings differently than you do. You're
22 making very heartfelt, honest comments that go to
23 the essence of what it is to be a human being and
24 want to relate to other people. But these people
25 look at these hearings in a technical fashion.

56

1 Now, I'm an attorney, and so they look at
2 it from technical standpoints, you know, of what's
3 going to happen, how it's going to happen, whether
4 it's justifiable on some kind of environmental
5 level.

6 You know, what we've got going here -- I
7 went back and looked at the 2010 complex. This
8 isn't the first time they have talked about
9 reorganizing. And they have rejected the kind of
10 comments that are being made. You know, Congress
11 has decided that we're going to use nuclear power.
12 Congress has decided that we're going to have
13 nuclear weapons. You know? What's really not being
14 considered here -- are you turning me down? What is
15 really not being considered here is the
16 no-production/only-reduction alternative. Instead,
17 what we've got is 10,000 current nuclear weapons,
18 5,000 of which are deployable. We want to make
19 another 2,200 of an entirely new line. They tell
20 us -- see, it's all a semantic game. They play this
21 huge semantic game, reliable replacement warhead.
22 Reliable. That implies that our current warheads
23 are somehow not reliable. Well, ask the Japanese
24 about that. They have been testing these for years.
25 You know? We've done over 1,000 tests aboveground

1 of these weapons. We've contaminated every single
2 community that the DOE, the Atomic Energy
3 Commission, has ever been at. We're continuing to
4 contaminate LANL. We're continuing to contaminate
5 Sandia with these laboratories producing these
6 poisons.

7 I guess what I'd like to talk about a
8 little bit today is the Sandia Labs mixed wasteland
9 fill. You know, you have got about 700,000 cubic
10 feet of mixed waste out there that's radioactive and
11 hazardous waste that's sitting over Albuquerque's
12 water supply. You talk about a bomb. This is a
13 time bomb waiting to happen to Albuquerque's water
14 supply. It's only a question of when. Not if.

15 Now, the NNSA, DOE, Sandia Laboratories,
16 are determined not to clean this up. And they have
17 played this regulatory game out there where they
18 call it a duck because it won't fly as a goose.
19 Okay? And what they have done is come up with this
20 plan where they're going to leave a vegetative cover
21 over these hundreds of thousands of toxic legacy
22 wastes from the last round of bomb making.

23 Now, Citizen Action Today filed a request
24 to make a complaint with the Inspector General for
25 the Department of Energy for criminal activities at

1 Sandia Laboratories involved with the mixed
2 wasteland fill. Now, as I told you, I'm an

3 attorney. I'm not trying to come up with a bunch of
4 funny business. I'm telling you there's serious
5 violations of federal law which are proceeding out
6 there. There's serious violations of federal law
7 that are proceeding at LANL.

8 Now, there's no proper well monitoring
9 system at either LANL or at Sandia Laboratories that
10 complies with federal law for monitoring the
11 movement of groundwater under the lands owned by the
12 laboratories. For years, they told the people here
13 that these waters were headed towards the north at
14 the laboratory. They're headed directly west,
15 towards the Mesa del Sol development. Okay? Now,
16 when are they going to dig up these wastes? That's
17 the question. How long are they going to wait? Are
18 they going to wait until Mesa del Sol is fully
19 developed with 10,000 homes in place? Maybe 100,000
20 people living there? Is that what we're going to
21 wait for? Are we going to wait until the water of
22 Albuquerque is contaminated with these wastes?

23 Now, people say, "Oh, well, it's so
24 expensive to dig up."

25 Yeah, it's going to be expensive. Now,

59

1 tell me what the price of Albuquerque water ought to
2 be. Take away Albuquerque water. You know, they
3 have got plutonium -- not plutonium. Neptunium 237
4 in the municipal wells in Santa Fe right now. They
5 have recently discovered that. There is no
6 epidemiological studies for the air quality in the
7 region of Sandia. There has been no dose

8 reconstruction studies done for Sandia. Sandia's
9 going to be loading the neutron tubes with plutonium
10 that provides neutron for the plutonium trigger.
11 And doing that, they're going to be releasing some
12 approximately 800 curies of tritium into the air
13 around Sandia.

14 So these are the problems that need to be
15 taken care of. You know, you have got 14,000 pits
16 that exist at Pantex in Texas. Now you're talking
17 about making another 200 pits. These pits will last
18 for 90 to 100 years. The average age of a pit is
19 about 21, 22 years, and we got 70 more years to
20 think about this kind of thing.

21 Now, this isn't really an environmental
22 impact statement that they're talking about here.
23 What this is is a supplement to an impact statement
24 that's over ten years old. And they have got tons
25 of other documents that that ten-year old document

60

1 references. They have got lots of documents that
2 have occurred since the 2010 complex document was
3 put on line. And I'm telling you, they're giving
4 you, what, 60, 90 days for comments on this? You
5 need at least another 180 days if you're going to
6 really look at the implications of this. So I would
7 suggest that they do that.

8 Also, you know, I'm not just speaking on
9 behalf of Citizen Action Today. I'm speaking on
10 behalf of millions of people that live in major
11 metropolitan cities in this country that cannot have

12 the opportunity to speak at these hearings, because
13 the NNSA refuses to hold them at major metropolitan
14 areas. I'm speaking for my brother out in Seattle.
15 I'm speaking for my seven-year-old son and
16 17-year-old daughter in Costa Mesa, California. I'm
17 talking for some of the people out in New York City,
18 you know. These people are being ripped off for
19 health care, for education. Look at the violence in
20 our schools that's going on, you know. That like
21 filters down. It filters down.

22 MR. LAWSON: Mr. McCoy, you're now at ten
23 minutes. How much more time would you like?

24 MR. McCOY: Just a couple of minutes.

25 MR. LAWSON: Okay.

61

1 MR. McCOY: Now on the EIS scoping, I ask
2 you all to demand that they not be able to separate
3 the environmental segment from the weapons
4 production side of things, okay? They did that with
5 the last hearing. They said, "Oh, we're going to
6 talk about environmental management over here. Oh,
7 we're going to talk about the weapons over here," as
8 if they have no relationship.

9 Now, I went into the office of a colleague
10 this morning. I said, "There's nothing
11 environmental about this." And I was thinking from
12 the standpoint of, you know, nothing healthy for the
13 environment from this standpoint. And my colleague
14 reassured me, "Oh, it's environment, all right.
15 Just think about the environmental damage it will do
16 once they start blowing one of these bombs up in

17 different places."

18 This project is going to be nothing but a
19 chain of misery for New Mexico communities. You
20 have been wiping out the Navajos with the uranium
21 mines. You have got cancer victims in Albuquerque
22 and Los Alamos. You have got contaminated air,
23 soil, and water that's going to exist for thousands
24 of generations, poisoning the future. Who are you
25 people to make these kind of decisions that are

62

1 going to wipe out people 1,000 years in the future?
2 These are your own descendants. You have no respect
3 for life? You have no respect for the future?

4 I asked one guy in a restaurant yesterday,
5 I said, "Hey, you know, they're going to have these
6 bombplex hearings tomorrow. You know anything about
7 it?"

8 He says, "No, I don't. What's going on?"

9 I said, "Well, they want to make a whole
10 new line of nuclear weapons." And I said, "Have you
11 got a comment that you want me to relay to that
12 meeting since you're not going to go?"

13 And he said, "Yeah," he said, "we got
14 enough trouble as there is without making more."

15 You know, this violates international
16 treaties, it violates our own constitution, and I'll
17 just close with a couple of remarks, if you'll
18 permit me, on the aspect of deterrence. You know,
19 what is deterrence? Deterrence is when you have no
20 friends and you are surrounded by enemies.

21 Deterrence is: You have done things in the world in
22 Nicaragua, Guatemala, Haiti, Vietnam, Iran, Iraq,
23 other places, where you have made an absolute idiot
24 of yourself and you have created a lot of enemies,
25 and we've done that around the world. The

63

1 technology is out there. The supplies of plutonium
2 are out there. The secrets are out. In fact, we
3 put a lot of that stuff on the street ourselves.
4 And if the rest of the world hates us enough, they
5 will conspire, as they now are doing, to create
6 these weapons to attack us with them. And if we're
7 going to stand there in a menacing fashion and
8 threaten the rest of the world with this kind of
9 thing and start up a whole new line of nuclear
10 weapon production, I can guarantee you the Iranians,
11 the Japanese, the North Koreans -- they're all going
12 to want one, and we've got enough that we could
13 probably put them in Wal-Marts around the world for
14 the rest of the world. Thank you. (Applause.)

15 MR. LAWSON: Okay. Just to give you an
16 update, I now have almost 25 past 2:00. I believe I
17 have nine more speakers who have signed up to speak.
18 So I'd like to move right along. Tom Lockwood would
19 be our next speaker, and he would be followed by
20 Senator Shannon Robinson, who I understand is here.

21 MR. LOCKWOOD: Thank you for being here
22 today. My name is Tom Lockwood. I'm a Gray
23 Panther, which makes me an honorary Raging Grannie.
24 I'm a retired educator. I taught for a number of
25 years. I was able to start quite a few new programs

1 which were called alternative schools, which are now
2 called something else, you know, the other schools.
3 I was an administrator for a number of years.
4 Forgive the expression. Joke. And we have heard
5 references to education. I'll get through that.
6 I keep up an interest in what's going on
7 in our schools. I'm also a reader of George Orwell,
8 and I find quite a bit of Orwellian context here.
9 For example -- and it was brought up -- what is
10 meant by "deterrent"? I need some definitions. And
11 also "the foreseeable future." Boy, that's pretty
12 wide open, isn't it? And provide the safe secure
13 deterrent and security for the poor. Who is our
14 enemy? Who are all these enemies out there that are
15 on the brink of coming to damage and attack the
16 United States? I don't know who they are. My God
17 almighty, we're the most powerful nation. We have
18 enough, as has been pointed out. Really can't add
19 much to what others have said, I endorse it so
20 strongly, and you have heard it. We have enough to
21 bring the world to an end, for heaven's sake. We're
22 worried about these smaller nations that are going
23 to come and attack us? Harry Truman, forgive him,
24 had a word for that. Eyewash. I say "forgive him,"
25 because of the action he took at the end of World

1 War II, which I participated in.

2 And also this matter of the timeline. I

3 would like to ask Mr. Wyka a question with regard to
4 that. There is a notice of intent. You have it
5 before you. You don't need to look at it. I'll
6 just recite it quickly. Published draft, and public
7 hearings on the new draft, summer, this summer,
8 summer of 2007, and then we get to 2008. And we
9 cram into 2008 the hearings and the publishing of
10 the final draft and the decision to be made in 2008
11 that says record of decision. So it's just in time
12 for our decider. That really worries me.

13 And also there's reference been made,
14 Mr. Wyka, to Congressional participation in the
15 final draft. And you have referred to approval of
16 Congress. Tell me, how much time is Congress going
17 to have before the decision? Has there been any
18 thought on that, or any history to how much Congress
19 has participated in these timelines that have been
20 presented before? That worries me. We have a
21 little bit of a new Congress now. And I wonder if
22 they're going to have time to really look at this.
23 And the time for the public to participate in is too
24 short. It's been pointed out to us.

25 Also, I as an educator, I love those kids.

66

1 I'm worried about the atmosphere of fear. Not only
2 what it does to adults, this undercurrent of fear
3 that has afflicted us as a result of the propaganda
4 that has been hammered over and over and over again
5 over the past several decades. What does that do to
6 the conception of the future for these kids
7 particularly? We're in the future. It's already

8 affected us. But what does it do for these kids as
9 they look forward to -- as they're emerging into
10 adolescence and adulthood and decision-making? What
11 does it do when they see all this propaganda about
12 what's going to happen if we don't build up this
13 great system of armaments, nuclear? It just doesn't
14 take much imagination to know what that does to a
15 young person's thinking, the discouragement and what
16 that discouragement will do to their actions.

17 Well, there was a comment made that poets
18 do not make a difference. Was that the --

19 MS. HOGGE: "Poetry makes nothing happen."

20 MR. LOCKWOOD: "Poetry makes nothing
21 happen." Well, I think it does. I think of Robert
22 Frost, when he said, "The woods are lovely, dark,
23 and deep, but I have promises to keep and miles to
24 go before I sleep."

25 Well, a lot of us are in that position

67

1 before we sleep. And we're not giving up. And I
2 say, along with the Gray Panthers, too, the
3 economics of this thing, where does the money go?
4 When we look at the needs in education, to assist
5 those teachers and in health care, to get a decent
6 health program going in this country, rather than
7 the tacky kind of thing which was passed recently,
8 which has left right now a number of seniors in that
9 Medicare program with the pharmaceuticals
10 attached -- it has left them in the famous doughnut
11 hole, that gap. My God. Here they are, paying for

12 insurance, and they're not getting anything in
13 consideration until they reach a higher level. They
14 have to pay within that time.

15 And I just cite that as the kind of just
16 tacky kind of token kinds of efforts that have been
17 made to meet the terrific health care needed. It's
18 been outlined for you. I won't repeat it.

19 But I will conclude with that and I would
20 like some answers to these vague questions, for
21 example, or to react to adverse geopolitical
22 changes, adverse geopolitical changes. Boy, that's
23 a fearful idea, isn't it? It's back to the kind of
24 atmosphere it imposes on this nation and the people,
25 and I would suggest that there's a great deal of

68

1 vagueness -- I won't suggest; I'll assert that -- to
2 the rationales that are given. I agree with one of
3 the speakers that this isn't a time for additional
4 work in this area. This is a time for reduction of
5 arms.

6 So I conclude with just repeating the
7 poetry idea. And I think you do make a difference.
8 You made a difference today, my poetess. And go
9 back to Robert Frost. We have miles to go before we
10 sleep. Miles to go. And I really have learned a
11 lot from you people today. And I endorse you fully.
12 Thanks. (Applause.)

13 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
14 is Senator Shannon Robinson, to be followed by Tiska
15 Blankenship.

16 SENATOR ROBINSON: Thank you for the time.

17 I really appreciate being here. I do not think this
18 is a question just for the President and the
19 Congress. Obviously, that's not true, because we
20 are all here. I think it's important to understand
21 that decisions are made by people, and are not
22 decisions made by institutions. And so we are here
23 as a vibrant part of that decision-making process.

24 I would like to talk first to the entire
25 idea of special nuclear weapons being consolidated.

69

1 I'm sorry, special nuclear materials being
2 consolidated. Having gone through numerous
3 consolidations of authority throughout my -- I have
4 been in the Senate 18 years. And who'd a thunk it?
5 But I ended up going through a lot of consolidations
6 and reorganizations of authorities within state
7 government, and have watched those take place in the
8 federal government, as well. It's hardly ever that
9 we go through one of those processes for the first
10 two years without a tremendous communication
11 disaster. And the second two years following those
12 become tremendous authority containment disasters.
13 And I think we need to understand that the Homeland
14 Security Department stands as just a model example
15 of consolidating to the point of ineffectiveness.

16 I would like to say that NNSA has a very
17 viable alternative before it. And that is their
18 no-action alternative. I think the no-action
19 alternative sweeps through each one of these
20 considerations and has justifiable arguments on a

21 government authority and government responsibility
22 guidelines. For example, I think there were
23 decisions that were made to put certain
24 responsibilities for our nuclear mission in certain
25 repositories. LANL was elected to work on small pit

70

1 renovations and small pit development. Why would
2 you at this point want to disrupt their activities
3 and move their operation to another location, move
4 all the various special nuclear materials with them,
5 or consolidate at LANL and move other organizations
6 and materials into LANL?

7 We learned something at Sandia. We
8 learned that when we disposed of nuclear materials
9 in the past, we didn't know of some of the harms, or
10 we did not respect some of the harms that we did
11 know about. It has taken us literally the last 20
12 years to go back and interview every employee at
13 Sandia and Kirtland to find out what their
14 experience was of disposing of nuclear materials.
15 Sandia did a very good job of doing that. We have
16 decided not to touch them. We have decided that
17 it's more important not to move those materials to
18 protect the environment. That's a decision that we
19 made. There were decisions that the population in
20 my senate district made in coordination with that,
21 because we all got to participate.

22 Once again we're getting to participate
23 now. I think our collective decision is: Do not
24 move nuclear materials. Any hazards that are in
25 effect with those nuclear materials when they are in

1 place are exponentially changed when you begin to
2 move them. Why consolidate authority for regional
3 efforts that are acknowledged as very effective?
4 Realize that we made a decision not to get engaged
5 in any more nuclear underground tests. And as a
6 result, we have still been able to know that we have
7 a stable nuclear weaponry system without going
8 through a test. And these tests have been simulated
9 and are very effective. Why would we consolidate
10 that system and cross authority lines once again?

11 We have an extraordinary opportunity. Our
12 extraordinary opportunity -- the world is now
13 watching to see how we will respond to a decision
14 proposed that I believe would invade and violate the
15 nonproliferation treaties. What we did in the
16 longest war, during our time when we were Saddam
17 Hussein's ally and Iraq's ally, during the time when
18 he actually launched chemical weapons against Iran,
19 during a time when he actually launched chemical
20 weapons into the Kurdish northern area of Iraq, we
21 saw those launches on satellite systems that we were
22 providing information to Iraq during the longest
23 war. We were also, at the same time, neutralizing
24 the Persian Gulf against the Iranian navy that was
25 supplied -- their ships were supplied by the

1 American Navy. So why were we involved in all those
2 dynamics when we, in fact, knew that those weapons

3 of mass destruction were actually used by the US
4 ally? And we continued in that relationship.

5 This is not forgotten by the world. This
6 is remembered as if it was yesterday by the
7 Iranians. The joke in Europe was always, during our
8 time when we were beginning to go it alone in
9 Iraq -- the decision -- the joke in Europe was, "Why
10 do Bush and Blair know that Iraq has weapons of mass
11 destruction? And it's of course because we kept the
12 receipts."

13 We need to be able to go back in time and
14 look at our involvement in providing chemicals to
15 various companies that then provided them to Iraq
16 during that longest war. That's a responsibility we
17 have. It's still with us. The world is watching
18 now to see if we are going to appropriately take the
19 no-action alternative. I would like you to know
20 that this extraordinary opportunity allows us to say
21 that no, we will not develop tritium any further in
22 regard to nuclear pit -- plutonium pit production.
23 That we will use the environmental test facilities
24 we already have, that are already operating and are
25 operating effectively.

73

1 The only thing I say that we can
2 accelerate is actually the decommissioning of our
3 nuclear weapons stockpile. But the truth is that
4 now that Los Alamos National Laboratories and Sandia
5 National Labs -- Sandia, which holds the largest
6 store of nuclear weapons, and Los Alamos National
7 Labs, which is still continuing to monitor and work

8 with the pits that we have and to determine that
9 they can be properly tested without an explosive
10 occurrence -- that, in fact, these environmental
11 test facilities are working, and it's an opportunity
12 for us that, as we find older nuclear weapons, we
13 can decommission them, we can accelerate that
14 process, and we can accept the no-action alternative
15 at all levels through our system.

16 I am very thankful that I have had an
17 opportunity to be with you here today and to make a
18 statement, mostly because I think it's a
19 responsibility of all elected officials now to take
20 an opportunity to make a statement such as this,
21 whether you agree with me or not. Thank you very
22 much. (Applause.)

23 MR. LAWSON: Our next speaker is Tiska
24 Blankenship, followed by Sally McCarthy.

25 MS. BLANKENSHIP: I'm Tiska Blankenship,

74

1 and I'm representing the Network of Spiritual
2 Progressives, Action Group Number 9 for nuclear
3 disarmament and other nuclear issues.

4 We call for nuclear disarmament and
5 adherence to the nonproliferation treaties that the
6 US has already signed. I am a US citizen, a
7 Unitarian, a Buddhist, an artist, and a daughter of
8 a US military Army colonel. As a child I lived in
9 occupied Japan. I know what nuclear destruction
10 costs a human population. The entire world must
11 disarm itself of nuclear weapons. There is no place

12 for the use of such weapons of mass destruction in a
13 world dedicated to peace in the 21st century. The
14 nuclear industry is a welfare program for
15 New Mexico. We don't want this industry. It is a
16 myth that our economy does well because of this
17 military industry. Facts show that poverty has
18 increased since the industry came here into
19 New Mexico. Our immediate health is in danger from
20 the production of nuclear elements in the
21 bomb-making. We need to step back, we need to
22 follow the cautionary principle. There are no
23 guarantees with the weapons or their byproducts.
24 I challenge the DOE to apply their money
25 and skills toward ways to support a healthy quality

75

1 of environmental life and a truly moral goodwill
2 toward all human beings. Please stop deceiving us
3 and wasting our resources. We want you to stop
4 directing our money and resources toward negative
5 and destructive purposes. We want you to reverse
6 your direction and move toward true acts of peace
7 that can regain our trust. Thank you for allowing
8 this time. (Applause.)

9 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
10 is Sally McCarthy, to be followed by Carol Benson.

11 MS. McCARTHY: Thank you. How are we
12 keeping track of what's being said today? It's been
13 recorded?

14 MR. LAWSON: Yes, it is, verbatim, right
15 here.

16 MS. McCARTHY: Okay. I am on the Learning
Page 64

17 curve about nuclear energy because part of me is
18 saying that nuclear energy for alternative sources
19 of energy is something that is viable and workable.
20 But from what I understand, nuclear weaponry is not
21 something that I favor. And, in fact, I see that it
22 is hazardous to our health, and we in America, if we
23 are an American -- if this is a governmental action,
24 in America we are entitled to life, liberty, and the
25 pursuit of happiness, and I find that creating a

76

1 system that is damaging to our health is
2 counterproductive to life, liberty, and the pursuit
3 of happiness.

4 I have recently been reading a book by
5 Joan Chittister, who writes about her journey from
6 Finland to Beijing by way of train for the fourth
7 United Nations conference on women. And in her
8 passage through Kiev, Russia, she speaks about her
9 what they saw pertaining to nuclear dumping grounds.
10 Ukraine wants the nuclear dumping ground of the
11 Soviet Union -- found itself left to clean up what
12 it had not created. And she goes on to say that "It
13 was a Christian nation, America, that invented the
14 end of the world and stores it in the cornfields of
15 Kansas. It was a Christian nation, America, that
16 had unleashed the technology that was now, little by
17 little, destroying this nation of Ukraine. The
18 people there were surrounded by death, missile
19 sites, defile the land. The failed nuclear reactor
20 at Chernobyl poisons the people. Thyroid cancers

21 have increased 100 percent, since the nuclear power
22 plant disaster. Birth defects are common now,
23 valuable farmland deteriorated under radioactive
24 pollution. 'We are a dying society now,' the
25 minister for the environment reported. 'Be on voice

77

1 for us, we need help.' "

2 I think that we in America can do
3 something that is more constructive than continue to
4 build nuclear weapons, and I oppose any of the
5 alternatives that you have, and I hope that we will
6 do away with nuclear weapons. Thank you.

7 (Applause.)

8 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. We've been going
9 for two straight hours, and the court reporter has
10 indicated that a four-or-five-minute break would
11 really be welcome right now. So I'd ask you if you
12 could stay close by to your seats, so we can get
13 started right away. I was hoping that we would
14 finish by 3:00. I don't think that we will, but
15 nevertheless, we will start up again this evening at
16 the scheduled time.

17 (A recess was taken from 2:53 to 3:00.)

18 MR. LAWSON: Okay, we're going to get
19 started again, if I could ask you to take seats,
20 please. While you're doing that, I should have
21 mentioned, I know a number of people choose a recess
22 to leave. I want those people who are leaving to
23 know that we really appreciate your time today and
24 the comments that you made. They're very much
25 appreciated.

1 Okay. I'd like to get started again. We
2 have six more speakers who are signed up, and I
3 would like to tell the registration people if
4 anybody else signed up, have them sign up for
5 tonight, please. Our next speaker is Carol Benson,
6 followed by Marjorie Williams.

7 MS. BENSON: Hello. I have always had
8 trouble talking about the obvious and to me this is
9 just so ludicrously obvious, it's always been hard
10 for me to get up and talk publicly about it. But
11 I'm going to make a stab. I'm going to use somebody
12 else's words for one thing, because I think they're
13 so fine. This is Mairead Corrigan McGuire, in her
14 book called The Vision of Peace. She's the one that
15 is the Irish winner of the Nobel Peace Prize. And
16 this is short. But she says, "When we examine where
17 we are today, given the politics and technology of
18 violence, we can only conclude that we live in an
19 insane world. Is it not insanity to go on producing
20 nuclear and conventional weapons that, if used, can
21 destroy millions of people, if not the whole planet?
22 Is it not insanity to spend billions of dollars to
23 maintain these arsenals while millions of children
24 die of disease and starvation each year? Where
25 according to the United Nations, 60,000 children die

1 every day of starvation, even though the world's
2 governments had the resources and capability of

3 ending starvation and misery immediately?"

4 Do you remember all that talk about the
5 green revolution, how one of these days we were
6 going to have able to have enough food to feed
7 everybody? We got that long ago.

8 "Is it not insanity to produce and export
9 weapons of destruction to poor third world countries
10 instead of export food, medicine, and the
11 necessities of life? Is it not insanity that the
12 United States and the European Union, of which
13 Britain is a major arms contributor, now export 70
14 percent of the world's arms to poor third world
15 countries? Some of these countries bankrupt
16 themselves to pay for these arms, which in many
17 cases will be used by military regimes against their
18 own people. Is it not insanity, for example, that
19 India's government continues to waste so many
20 resources on militarism, while so many other people
21 are in need of the basic necessities of life? Is it
22 not insanity to pollute the air, poison the oceans,
23 dump radioactive material, destroy the ozone, send
24 plutonium into outer space and destroy the
25 environment?"

80

1 Those are just a few words of Mairead
2 McGuire. I'd just like to add that every week
3 there's some proposal in our papers for something
4 new, something big and wonderful, like a streetcar,
5 a base on the moon. We'll be hearing about a new
6 arena. And there doesn't seem to be a lot of
7 question that we'll come up with the money, but we

8 can't do anything about small classes in our
9 schools, or crime, or getting health insurance for
10 people that would just -- that's impossible. We
11 can't come up with the money. And we found out --
12 we all know now that this invasion of Iraq was
13 lunacy, sheer lunacy. And I can't forget an idea
14 that I heard in about 2003, about what if we had
15 taken the same money we've spent on this war and we
16 had just done one simple thing. What if we had just
17 given every child in this world clean water to
18 drink? Do you think that would have been a good
19 deterrent from having people come over here and bomb
20 us? I think it would have been an excellent
21 deterrent. Thank you. (Applause.)

22 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. The next speaker
23 is Marjorie Williams, and then Sally-Alice Thompson.

24 MS. WILLIAMS: I had not originally
25 planned to speak, so I don't have any polished

81

1 thing, but I just had a couple of questions that --
2 you covered so many different areas that I would
3 have, if I'd prepared. But I just wonder why there
4 are only three options. None of these really
5 counter what most people have been saying here.
6 Reduce operations sounds good, but then you have
7 got -- reading it, you know, this continued
8 dismantlement for presidential direction. The
9 current president would be a disaster.

10 Would not -- whatever production capacity,
11 it would have to meet current national security

12 objectives. Now, I don't know whether anybody's
13 mentioned those, what those are. Suppose, as
14 someone mentioned, that somebody did get a small
15 bomb and put it in the Seattle airport and there was
16 disruption. Maybe several hundred people -- I mean,
17 several thousand people, maybe a hundred thousand.
18 But it wouldn't destroy the world. What would we
19 do? Would we be as absurd as attacking Iraq when
20 they weren't having to do with 9/11 at all? It's so
21 mind-boggling to even think about the possibility
22 that we want to have -- we should be defending our
23 ports, not building more bombs. That's all I want
24 to say. Thank you.

25 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Then Sally-Alice

82

1 Thompson, to be followed by Cecilia Chavez.

2 MS. THOMPSON: I'm Sally-Alice Thompson.
3 I'm a Veteran for Peace. I looked around and I met
4 a number of these people that are wearing name tags.
5 All the women are beautiful, the men are handsome,
6 and they're all charming. And I listened carefully
7 to the three alternatives, and I found that they all
8 have one basic idea behind them, that we continue to
9 have nuclear weapons. So I think that we should
10 have an alternative number 4, which would be that we
11 don't -- that instead of making more weapons,
12 instead of maintaining the weapons we have, we get
13 rid of the weapons we have, we get rid of -- we use
14 the scientists to find ways to clean up the messes
15 that we already have, we use these beautiful,
16 charming people to undo the indoctrination that we

17 have done with our young people.

18 You see, we have no young people here.

19 They have all been indoctrinated that everything is
20 fine, that this is the way it should be. We need to
21 have people like you and like you other people that
22 are wearing your name tags going out and teaching
23 people what kind of country we really would like to
24 have. I think that in the timeline for 2008, we
25 should definitely be beginning to disarm the

83

1 American nuclear weapons. By 2012, we should have
2 Israel disarmed nuclearly. We should have Pakistan
3 without nuclear weapons. We should have India
4 without nuclear weapons, all those nuclear weapons.
5 And the ships at sea should no longer have nuclear
6 weapons on them. And the danger that we are
7 actually under would be diminished and maybe we
8 could even realize the fact that wars are
9 unwinnable. If we can't defeat a country that was
10 on its knees under sanctions for ten years after
11 having undergone two wars -- if we can't defeat
12 them, what in the hell are we talking about, about
13 winning wars? It just -- it's so stupid, I can't --
14 it's hard to believe.

15 So anyway, let's pretend that we really
16 are being listened to. How many vote for
17 alternative number 1, to keep on going what we're
18 doing now? How many vote for 2 or 3, which mean
19 changing some names and moving a few chess pieces
20 around and still making more nuclear weapons? How

21 many vote for alternative number 4, and getting rid
22 of nuclear weapons? (Applause.) I hope you're
23 listening. Thank you.

24 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. This is Cecilia
25 Chavez. And she'll be followed by Sharon Gross.

84

1 MS. CHAVEZ: I think I'm going to start a
2 little petition there in the back for a high chair
3 for you gentlemen, for tomorrow. I'm sure that the
4 people who hire you will provide you with such a
5 thing.

6 MR. LAWSON: Thanks.

7 MS. CHAVEZ: I'm here just for fun. No.
8 Really, I'm here because I'm a human being, and two
9 months ago, I had the pleasure to meet my nephew.
10 He is eight months old, and I'm sorry I don't have
11 my PowerPoint presentation ready for you, so that
12 you can see what a beautiful creature he is. And
13 that is what is making me stand here, really,
14 nothing else.

15 Excuse me if I am not as articulate as
16 some other speakers who have actually said
17 everything that I really need to say, because I am
18 with them. But I did write down some notes and I
19 would like to read them. The first one is that
20 there is a lot of knowledge here in this room, and
21 it's all over the room, not just on one spot, and
22 it's not just, you know, sitting all together. I
23 have learned a lot. Thank you very much for all
24 your words and your solidarity. The basic message
25 here obviously is no production, only reduction,

1 just to copy what Dave said earlier. My future is
2 not Complex 2030 at all. There is no way that
3 nuclear weapons can be secure, and please don't tell
4 us that. I do not want warheads. I would like to
5 ask that you take care of your old weapons and do
6 not continue creating or upgrading any weapon
7 whatsoever. We are humans, and we have the
8 capability to be responsible for life, and that's,
9 again, that's the reason why I'm here, my nephew.

10 Don't tell me the President and Congress
11 decided this, and that there are only three
12 alternates. The President was not put where he is
13 by popular desire, agreement, or demand. Nobody
14 asked him to be there, actually. He shouldn't be
15 there. Twice. Okay? I am with Sally Ellis and
16 other people who say three alternatives are not
17 enough. We want number 4. That's why we are here.
18 And again, it is all connected. We have been all
19 over the map talking about Iraq and mixed waste
20 landfill and Sandia Labs and Los Alamos and Seattle
21 and here and there, plutonium, tritium, all these
22 things, and it's all the same thing. We want life.
23 So wherever you see it from, it comes to the thing,
24 which is where you are coming from. You know?
25 Where we are coming from. And that's it. I just

1 wanted to ask you to please put technology, science,
2 and our tax money to work for life and for peace.

3 Thank you. (Applause.)

4 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our next speaker
5 is Sharon Gross, and she'll be followed by our final
6 speaker, Don Henshaw.

7 MS. GROSS: My name is Sharon Gross, and I
8 was motivated to speak today because of the
9 presentation slide about the responsive
10 infrastructure that said this is a capability to
11 meet national security requirements in a timely,
12 cost-effective, and agile manner, and under that
13 slide -- and many of you have it in your
14 possession -- there were a list of things that would
15 be done, including maintain a capability to design,
16 develop, and produce new or adaptive warheads in the
17 event of new military requirements. And the
18 statement was made that this is mandated by Congress
19 and the president. And when I heard that, and I
20 read this, and I thought about it, it seemed to me
21 that this is extremely important, this particular
22 framework, because much of what is discussed here
23 and much of what we all do in our lives is starting
24 from a beginning point, the starting point, the
25 issue, the framework, and it's very, very important

87

1 how we frame the framework and what our basic
2 question is.

3 And I would encourage the work to go back
4 to the framework, because I think you can answer the
5 capability to meet national security requirements in
6 a timely, cost-effective, and agile manner in a
7 different way. And I am thinking that you can meet

8 your national security requirements by pursuing
9 cooperative efforts to reduce threats around the
10 world, by pursuing the nuclear nonproliferation
11 treaty, by working for energy sustainability, by
12 decreasing the risk that nuclear fission materials
13 will fall into the hands of rogue states or
14 terrorists. And it seems to me that all those means
15 are important and significant, and I would ask that
16 before a lot of complicated studies are pursued,
17 that the basic questions be looked at again and, if
18 necessary, that they be thrown back to the people
19 who are creating these frameworks to basically
20 redefine the framework.

21 I am concerned because I think that the
22 way our world seems to operate, when you think about
23 what happened in the cold war and what's happening
24 now, is that you have this kind of never-ending
25 cycle of like dominos that are falling. One country

88

1 gets weapons, so the next country needs weapons, so
2 the first country needs more weapons, and you think
3 of the first domino, you know. It went down, and if
4 there's a line of dominos, all the dominos fall
5 down. So basically, we have to stop this cycle of
6 just things -- you know, like one thing touching off
7 another thing. And certainly it's been shown that
8 during the cold war, the threat of the nuclear
9 weapons that the Soviet Union had and the other
10 weapons they had was much exaggerated, and the
11 United States responded to that by development. And

12 I think we're doing the same thing today.

13 And finally, I would like to encourage an
14 alternative 4 which is somewhat like what was stated
15 already, but I think in terms of looking at
16 alternatives, that if alternative 4 could be to meet
17 national security requirements in a timely,
18 cost-effective, and agile manner by doing the things
19 I listed, pursuing cooperative threat reduction
20 efforts, developing ways to meet the requirements of
21 the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, working for
22 energy sustainability, and decreasing this having
23 people that are irresponsible in rogue states and
24 other places, or even in our own country, get hold
25 of nuclear fission materials. So I would like the

89

1 study to focus on that as an alternative and related
2 ideas to improve or national security through ways
3 of getting rid of nuclear weapons. Thank you very
4 much. (Applause.)

5 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Our final speaker
6 will be Don Hancock.

7 MR. HANCOCK: My name is Don Hancock. I
8 work at Southwest Research and Information Center
9 here in Albuquerque, which has been involved with
10 energy, environmental, and health issues for 35
11 years. The last 31 years, I have been involved in
12 literally dozens of NEPA processes, many of which
13 have unfortunately been involved with the Department
14 of Energy. So let me just summarize a few things
15 that are similar to a number of things you have
16 heard.

17 The first thing I would say to DOE and
18 NNSA is, in terms of this process, you need to stop
19 and start over. At the end of the comment period,
20 rather than going ahead to the draft, you really
21 need to go back and rethink it. Sharon talked about
22 reframing it. I think a couple of things, just to
23 clearly show how far off the notice of intent is.
24 There is no discussion in the notice of intent of
25 really looking at the environmental impacts of the

90

1 bombplex "as it would exist in 2030," because if
2 there was, it would include a detailed discussion of
3 the actual impacts of using these weapons. Without
4 that kind of discussion, you aren't, in fact,
5 analyzing all of the environmental impacts.

6 Secondly, in terms of what that does, I
7 would argue it's required to do what you say you're
8 going to do, to look at the environmental impacts,
9 but since you also say this is part of deterrence,
10 the world and the people of the United States need
11 to know what the actual deterrent effect would be,
12 and therefore, you need to spell out what the
13 impacts of using the weapons are.

14 DOE's going to have to change its schedule
15 to do that kind of analysis, however, because you're
16 going to have to go to Pentagon documents that
17 analyze that. You're going to have to use publicly
18 available documents like what the International
19 Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War and
20 Physicians for Social Responsibility have developed

21 about what the impacts of nuclear war actually are,
22 and so it's going to take longer than the six or
23 seven months you have given for yourselves to write
24 your draft document.

25 Also, as has already been mentioned,

91

1 you're missing an essential alternative, and I
2 actually have a name for it. It's the
3 constitutional alternative. The US Constitution
4 alternative. You say that this is to analyze the
5 complex as it would exist in 2030, and what exists
6 in 2030 is likely to exist for decades beyond. I
7 would remind you that there are six presidential
8 elections between now and 2030, so you cannot base
9 the decision-makers -- this president and future
10 presidents cannot make their decisions just on the
11 limited set of alternatives that you have. The
12 Constitution of the United States, article 6, clause
13 2, says that treaties ratified by the Senate are,
14 quote, the supreme law of the land.

15 Well, one of the treaties that the Senate
16 of the United States has ratified -- and they did it
17 on March 13, 1969 -- was the nonproliferation
18 treaty, which went into effect on March 5 of 1970.
19 Article 6 of that treaty states, and I quote, each
20 of the parties to the treaty -- that includes the
21 United States -- undertakes to pursue negotiations
22 in good faith on effective measures relating to
23 cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date
24 and to nuclear disarmament and on a treaty on
25 general and complete disarmament under strict and

1 effective international control."

2 So that treaty is part of the supreme law
3 of the land. So the constitutional alternative has
4 to be, how would this and future presidents have a
5 nuclear weapons complex, or not, that complies with
6 that? So that additional alternative clearly as a
7 reasonable alternative complying with the US
8 Constitution has to be considered a reasonable
9 alternative, it would seem to me. So that needs to
10 be included.

11 And so therefore, by 2030 we should be
12 looking at the impacts of not having a nuclear
13 weapons complex, and what the alternative missions
14 would be, what the environmental and economic
15 impacts of such an alternative complex would be.
16 That's the kind of information that the public needs
17 to have in order to comment on the draft, the kind
18 of information that the decision-makers need to have
19 in order to make decisions.

20 For all of the alternatives, the draft
21 environmental impact statement must describe the
22 volumes and types of nuclear and hazardous waste,
23 how and where that waste will be stored and
24 disposed, the cost and impacts of such storage and
25 disposal. It's interesting on your map of the

1 nuclear weapons complex they left off the third
2 Department of Energy facility which is part of the

3 nuclear weapons complex in this state, called the
4 Waste Isolation Pilot Program. That's an essential
5 part of the nuclear weapons complex because that's
6 where the waste is going. That's part of the
7 complex, too, and the future complexes have to look
8 at, if you don't have in 2030, and between now and
9 then, anything else but WIPP for your nuclear
10 weapons disposal, that means that the draft
11 environmental impact statement has to analyze that
12 all storage and disposal of all wastes from the
13 complex will stay at those sites forever. So
14 analyze that one in your draft environmental impact
15 statement, too. Because WIPP is scheduled to close
16 about 2030, coincidentally, so everything that
17 happens after that has no place to go.

18 The full cost of dismantling and disposing
19 of the existing facilities, the cost of design,
20 constructing, operating, decontaminating, and
21 decommissioning all the facilities in bombplex 2030
22 must be fully analyzed and the cost described in the
23 draft EIS. And how those costs are, to use the term
24 in the notice of intent, "economically sustainable"
25 must be fully described and evaluated if you're

94

1 doing what you say you're going to do. You need to
2 describe the health and environmental impacts of
3 that existing complex as well as the new complex.

4 One of the things you talk about in the
5 notice of intent is the modernizing of existing
6 facilities. Okay. What are the costs, what are the
7 impacts of doing that? That has to be done. You

8 have to describe -- you used the term in the
9 presentation -- the intent talks about if the
10 existing nuclear weapons complex is not
11 cost-effective and cannot provide the infrastructure
12 for the future, then you need to describe in detail
13 why it can't do that, and what needs to be changed
14 in order to do those sorts of things.

15 You also need to describe, you argue --
16 and this has been mentioned -- that this helps with
17 deterrence. You need to analyze the impacts of the
18 bombplex 2030 actually creating proliferation rather
19 than its deterrence to proliferation. As a number
20 of people have said and as unfortunately current
21 history seems to be showing, there's a lot of
22 interest, as we're talking about new nuclear
23 weapons, since the 2001 nuclear posture review, a
24 lot of other nations are talking about getting
25 nuclear weapons, as well. And so it would appear

95

1 that the idea of the bombplex actually will be to
2 not result in deterrence, but rather proliferation.
3 So that needs to be analyzed fully in the impacts of
4 that evaluated in the draft EIS.

5 Regarding Sandia, the draft EIS needs to
6 examine the alternative that Kirtland Air Force Base
7 will be closed by 2030, and what would the nature of
8 Sandia Labs be in that case? In fact, there already
9 have been proposals to close Kirtland Air Force
10 Base, and they clearly could come back again in the
11 next 20 years.

12 That's just a small sampling of things
13 that you need to do, so that's why you need to stop
14 and start over with a new notice of intent that more
15 comprehensively deals with some of these issues and
16 others that I have mentioned. Thank you very much.
17 (Applause.)

18 MR. LAWSON: Thank you. Thank you very
19 much. And thank you all very much. Is there
20 anybody here who still would like to speak or speak
21 in private to the court reporter?

22 Thank you very much. I'm going to adjourn
23 in just one second. Before I do, I want to thank
24 you all of you for coming. As I mentioned earlier,
25 we recognize that it takes time out of a busy day,

96

1 and for those who addressed Mr. Wyka here, we really
2 appreciate that.

3 Remember that the comment period remains
4 open until January 17th. Also remember that we're
5 back here again this evening at 6:00, from 6:00 to
6 10:00, and I have been asked by several people when
7 we might start the comment period tonight. I
8 believe it will probably be around -- let me see if
9 I get this right, probably around 7:45, something
10 along those lines.

11 And I want to thank our court reporter,
12 Mary Seal, for her fine work. (Applause.)

13 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: How much weight,
14 in the scheme of things, with all the things that
15 are going on, will these comments have? You know, I
16 have heard some heartfelt things and some very

17 educated people here, and it already says that
18 Congress and the President and you are all in favor
19 of this, and so I want to know how much weight, if
20 any, the people speaking -- how much weight will be
21 given to that.

22 MR. WYKA: You know, I think we're getting
23 a lot of good comments, this is a good process.
24 It's really democracy in action. We're doing 17
25 public meetings across the country. We're getting a

97

1 lot of good feedback, and we feel the passion in the
2 room here, and we're seeing the same passion at
3 other sites with other different alternatives that
4 we need to look at.

5 I think it's going to be a significant
6 amount of weight. We have to take a look at these
7 comments, you know, see what we can do with the
8 alternatives, and we're going to be back, you know,
9 probably around the summertime frame with the
10 analysis done and be able to see how we included
11 your comments in the process.

12 SPEAKER FROM THE FLOOR: Thank you.

13 MR. LAWSON: Others may have questions.
14 I'd like to have you take that after we close the
15 meeting. Mr. Wyka will be here, Mr. Allen will be
16 here, if you have other questions. So thank you
17 very much. I appreciate it, and maybe we'll see you
18 back this evening. This meeting is now adjourned.

19 (The meeting concluded at 3:30 p.m.)

20

21
22
23
24
25

1 STATE OF NEW MEXICO
2 COUNTY OF BERNALILLO

SS

3

4

REPORTER' S CERTI F I C A T E

5

I , MARY ABERNATHY SEAL, New Mexi co

6

Certi fied Shorthand Reporter, DO HEREBY CERTI F Y that

7

I did admini ster the oath to the wi tness herei n

8

prior to the taking of this de position, and that I

9

did report in stenographic shorthand the proceedings

10

set forth herei n, and the foregoi ng is a true and

11

correct transcripti on of proceedings.

12

I FURTHER CERTI F Y that I am nei ther

13

employed by nor related to any of the parties or

14

attorneys in this case, and that I have no interest

15

whatsoever in the final disposition of this case in

16

any court.

17

18

Mary Abernathy Seal
Certi fied Court Reporter #69
Li cense expi res: 12-31-06

19

20

(2496A) MAS

21

Date taken: December 5, 2006

22

Proofread by: KW

23

24

25

NNSA open mtg 120506