

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY'S  
NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION  
Y-12 SITE-WIDE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT  
SCOPING MEETING

EVENING MEETING  
PUBLIC COMMENTS

DECEMBER 15, 2005

---

DANA HOLLOWAY, COURT REPORTER  
MILLER & MILLER COURT REPORTERS  
12804 Union Road  
Knoxville, TN 37934  
Phone 865-674-1471 / FAX 865-675-6398  
E-mail: JMcccon3590@aol.com

PUBLIC COMMENTS  
LIST OF SPEAKERS

1  
2  
3     GLEENDA STRUSS-KEYS..... 2  
4  
5     MARCUS KEYS..... 4  
6  
7     BARBARA WALTON..... 11  
8  
9     CINDY COLLINS..... 16  
10  
11    ANNE HABLAS..... 28  
12  
13    KAYCE COLLIN..... 29  
14  
15    MARY DENNIS LENTSCH..... 29  
16  
17    MARTIN STEPHENS..... 33  
18  
19    ERIK JOHNSON..... 36  
20  
21    RALPH HUTCHISON..... 39

23    (NOTE: Unless provided to the court reporter, all names are  
24    spelled to the best phonetic approximation.)  
25

1 GLENDA STRUSS-KEYS

2 Good evening everyone. As the last person  
3 who spoke here mentioned security issues, I'd like to  
4 approach the proposed plan for the modernization of the  
5 Y-12 plant from the point of security. One of the first  
6 tasks of government is to see that the people -- that we  
7 are secure.

8 And to me, I guess, I take Option 5. The  
9 continued production of nuclear weapons at the Y-12 Plant  
10 and the plan to modernize so that we can continue to make  
11 these weapons, is the greatest threat to national security  
12 and world security.

13 These are very troubled times and we need  
14 to listen to the collective wisdom of all people and  
15 nations. One way to do this is to enter into treaties and  
16 to abide by them. We must honor the Nonproliferation  
17 Treaty which binds us to work toward disarmament, not  
18 building more bombs. And building a new billion-dollar  
19 bomb plant totally disregards this treaty. The United  
20 States is not beyond the law.

21 Disarmament is the way to peace and the  
22 way to security.

23 If other nations that do not have nuclear  
24 weapons continue to be threatened by the United States,  
25 then they perceive that their security depends on building

1 weapons. And so we get into this cycle. And our resources  
2 go into death, rather than into working for real peace.

3                   You know, if a child brings a gun to  
4 school -- and we've had instances recently -- if a child  
5 brings a gun to school, the way to make everyone safe is  
6 not to give every child in the classroom a gun, but it  
7 would be to disarm that child, or the one who has the  
8 weapons or guns.

9                   So the way to secure peace for all, is for  
10 all of us -- U.S. to disarm, and put the money into ridding  
11 the world of injustice and poverty, and thus ridding the  
12 need for wars.

13                   As a member of this community, the  
14 community of East Tennessee, I feel an extra responsibility  
15 to say that we need to disarm now, since Oak Ridge is my  
16 neighborhood.

17                   So I entreat you, whomever I'm speaking  
18 to, not to proceed with your plans. We need to honor  
19 international treaties and we need to feed the poor. This  
20 is what would be for the greatest security for ourselves  
21 and the entire world. Thank you.

22

23

MARCUS KEYS

24

25

Thank you very much, and for the  
Department of Energy for giving me this opportunity to

1 speak this evening. I will not be as brief as the previous  
2 speaker, who happens to be my wife. But then how many  
3 married men here today can claim that they can be as brief  
4 as their wives.

5 I speak this evening as a person of faith  
6 as a person representing the Director of the Glenmary  
7 Commission on Justice, which covers ten states from  
8 Oklahoma to North Carolina, West Virginia, south. And  
9 Virginia, itself, and down as far as Mississippi and  
10 Georgia.

11 And I would like to speak as a person of  
12 faith, and to bring in that human dimensional morality.  
13 The moral dimensions, the moral consequences are the way we  
14 go. The moral environment which is part of the human  
15 environment. And I'll try to be as brief as I can and stay  
16 within the five minutes.

17 But in a message for the January 1, 2006  
18 celebration of the World Day of Peace, which was addressed  
19 to all people of goodwill and released just a week ago  
20 today, Pope Benedict XVI, my leader in my faith tradition  
21 wrote: "In view of the risks which humanity is facing in  
22 our time, all Catholics in every part of the world have a  
23 duty to proclaim and embody even more fully to "Gospel of  
24 Peace"...

25 So for me, this is another opportunity for

1 me to fulfill my responsibility as a Catholic Christian and  
2 the duty that the Pope writes about.

3           Early in that same letter, he wrote: "We  
4 need but think of the events of the past century when  
5 aberrant ideological and political systems willfully  
6 twisted the truth and brought about the exploitation and  
7 murder of an appalling number of men and women, wiping out  
8 entire families and communities. After experiences like  
9 these," he continued, "how can we fail to be seriously  
10 concerned about lies in our own time, lies which are the  
11 framework for menacing scenarios of death in many parts of  
12 the world? Any authentic search for peace must begin with  
13 the realization that the problem of truth and untruth is  
14 the concern of every man and woman; and it is decisive for  
15 the peaceful future of our planet."

16           For the Glenmary Commission on Justice,  
17 and for me personally -- and for me personally, one of the  
18 most hideous deceptions being perpetrated today on the  
19 people of the United States, and indeed on the people of  
20 the world, is that we cannot have peace without nuclear  
21 weapons, and even without the intention of using them;  
22 which we all remember President Bush saying he was willing  
23 to use if it was in our interest.

24           I, as a follower of Christ, who believes  
25 that "Jesus is the truth which gives us peace," we at the

1 Glenmary Commission on Justice wish to declare, without any  
2 ambiguity and without any hesitation, that we believe that  
3 nuclear weapons do not bring peace, nor contribute to the  
4 process of peace.

5                   So what then can be said about government,  
6 and our government in particular, which counts on nuclear  
7 weapons as a means of securing the security of their  
8 countries?

9                   As Pope Benedict XVI said, "Along with  
10 countless persons of goodwill, one can state that this  
11 point of view is not only baneful but...fallacious."  
12 Strong words from any religious leader; baneful, poisonous,  
13 and fallacious.

14                   In a nuclear war, there would be no  
15 victors, only victims. The truth of peace requires that  
16 all, whether those governments which openly or secretly  
17 possess nuclear arms, or those planning to acquire them,  
18 agree to change their course by clear and firm decisions  
19 and strive for progressive and concerted nuclear  
20 disarmament, which has become a farce as it relates to our  
21 country. We signed a Treaty of Nonproliferation. And we  
22 saw money in some of the things around this building, and  
23 money appropriated for nuclear nonproliferation.

24                   We signed it in 1970. President Nixon  
25 signed it after Congress passed the Non-Proliferation

1 Treaty. Where are we today? It has become a farce. And  
2 our country has become part of that farce in relation to  
3 the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

4 Today, I urge our government to stop the  
5 production of nuclear weapons at the Y-12 Plant, or  
6 anywhere else. We don't need them. And we certainly don't  
7 need new buildings to produce them.

8 Let us have the courage to go in a new  
9 direction. New hope for the future. I see it in some of  
10 the faces here. That's what I want, new hope for the  
11 future. But there is no hope in nuclear weapons, for us,  
12 for the planet at large, for the people of the planet at  
13 large.

14 My faith tradition teaches that "every act  
15 of war directed to the indiscriminate destruction of whole  
16 cities or vast areas with their inhabitants, is a crime  
17 against God and against people, which merits unequivocal  
18 condemnation." (As read.)

19 And I am here as a person of faith  
20 representing the Glenmary Commission of Justice to  
21 reiterate that teaching of my church. With the Pope and  
22 with the United States Catholic Bishops, we at the Glenmary  
23 Commission of Justice join with all people of goodwill in  
24 refusing "...to legitimize the idea of nuclear war." We  
25 reject nuclear war, and reject building those weapons of

1 mass destruction that prepare us for nuclear war.

2 Don't build a weapon unless you're ready  
3 to use them. And our President says he's ready to use  
4 them.

5 In the words of the Catholic Bishops that  
6 states, "In the words of our Holy Father John Paul II, we  
7 need a moral about-face." We need a new hope for the  
8 future. That's my little bit put in. "The whole world  
9 must summon the moral courage and technical means to say  
10 "No" to nuclear conflict; "No" to weapons of mass  
11 destruction; "No" to the arms race which robs the poor and  
12 the vulnerable; and "No" to the moral danger of a nuclear  
13 age which places before humankind, indefensible choices of  
14 constant terror or surrender."

15 Nuclear weapons assault life. We all know  
16 that. The assault -- nuclear weapons assault the life of  
17 the planet, they assault the planet itself; and in so  
18 doing, they assault the process of the continuing  
19 development of life on this planet and continued  
20 development of the planet itself.

21 And the preservation of the non-nuclear  
22 treaty demands an unequivocal commitment to genuine nuclear  
23 disarmament. So on behalf of my group, I say it should  
24 stop now. The new bomb plant idea is a bad idea. Let us  
25 make health care, decent housing, good education, and good,

1 well-paying and healthy jobs, available to our people.

2                   This is the challenge we wish to put to  
3 all who are pushing the need for new weapons of mass  
4 destruction and new plants in which to build them. We call  
5 upon all who are involved in this to take into  
6 consideration all of these ideas and these -- what I just  
7 said in relation to the moral life of the people -- take  
8 into consideration.

9                   And we call, particularly upon the  
10 military industrial academia complex, to move towards a new  
11 way for the future. To bring hope for the future. To go  
12 away into a more creative approach to life. Not producing  
13 death dealing products, which are abhorrent to me as a  
14 Christian. Abhorrent.

15                   I also ask and call upon our friends in  
16 the Union -- in the Union movement who we have always  
17 supported in their struggles for justice for their members,  
18 and for other workers who may not be members. We call upon  
19 them not to allow the need for good-paying jobs to  
20 determine their involvement in such destruction and the  
21 production of such weapons of mass destruction.

22                   Other criteria also must be used before  
23 accepting work that makes one complicit in the end results;  
24 weapons of mass destruction. The common good and the good  
25 of our planet are two basic criteria that we ask everyone

1 to seriously consider. It, as we believe, using nuclear  
2 weapons is reprehensible. Surely, being complicit in any  
3 direct way with helping to produce them must also be judged  
4 within the same moral framework.

5 Thank you for listening. And I apologize  
6 I had to go over time. Thank you.

7

8 BARBARA WALTON

9 I'm Barbara Walton and a resident of  
10 Oak Ridge. I participated in the previous Site-wide  
11 Environmental Impact Statement.

12 I too, am a person of faith. And I have  
13 been dismayed over the years of the slow progress of the  
14 disarmament and disbandment of nuclear weapons.

15 I think it is very important for us to  
16 realize that not every nation is moral. Not all of our  
17 leaders of this nation are necessarily moral. And not all  
18 people have goodwill, or we would not have had 911.

19 The important thing is, when nuclear  
20 weapons are dismantled -- and I hope the pace for that  
21 picks up in the future -- it seems to be tied somewhat to  
22 the Soviet Union. They seem to want to go step-by-step.  
23 And I would like to go faster.

24 And as a person of faith, I agree with  
25 much of what the previous speaker said.

1                   However, when you dismantle weapons, you  
2                   have the nuclear materials left; the plutonium and the  
3                   highly enriched uranium, that needs to be in a secure area,  
4                   kept safe so these people who are not of goodwill, people  
5                   who use terror to find their own end, cannot get it.

6                   And that's one reason you modified the  
7                   previous one. I see there were several EAs (phonetic) to  
8                   take material to foreign nations. And I think...

9                   I want to see Y-12 continue to store  
10                  highly enriched uranium.

11                  Now, I'm also aware that there was a  
12                  recent committee report that went to the head of Department  
13                  of Energy that's proposing consolidation of all the weapons  
14                  facilities into one, which would put plutonium and highly  
15                  enriched uranium in the same location.

16                  Now, when they first started working on  
17                  what to do with the excess weapons grade materials, which  
18                  was back -- I don't know, I'm guessing around '95 or '96 --  
19                  the first thing we said was to separate out the uranium  
20                  from the plutonium because it's easier to dispose of excess  
21                  HEU, because you can blend it down and use it for fuel for  
22                  reactors.

23                  I used to be an employee of NASA. I  
24                  worked on environmental satellites and weather satellites.  
25                  And believe me, global warming, and carbon dioxide, and

1 other greenhouse gases do contribute to the intensity and  
2 number of storms. There is a natural variability, but we  
3 really were devastated by storms this year. And we do need  
4 to cut back on our use of fossil fuel.

5                   And I think that nuclear energy production  
6 is part of what we need in the future. And, you know, we  
7 can't -- I don't think we're going to get many new plants  
8 licensed in the United States until the disposition  
9 aspect -- and I'm really talking Yucca Mountain -- is  
10 further along. I think WIP has been very successful. And  
11 I'm glad to see that the New Mexico Environmental  
12 Department has approved the handling of the remote handled  
13 true waste that we have quite a bit of here -- which has  
14 nothing to do with Y-12.

15                   I think that the alternatives listed are  
16 good ones to consider. Now, I would like the Draft EIS to  
17 address some points such as what -- how the design basis  
18 threat may have changed since the first Site-wide  
19 Environmental Impact Statement. And whether or not the  
20 land that becomes available... If you reduce the  
21 footprint, how much of that is needed as a bumper.

22                   I would like it to talk about  
23 remanufacturing, and how much of that we need to do.

24                   I'm so glad that Congress put a stop to  
25 the bunkerbuster nuclear thing that was at one point in the

1 U.S. budget. I'm not in favor of going out and developing  
2 brand new nuclear weapons. I don't think that's necessary.

3 But we do need to keep the materials that  
4 exist in a safe way. I think dismantling weapons is one of  
5 primary functions of Y-12. They also remanufacture some  
6 parts. And I think the risks, the pros and cons, of each  
7 of these alternatives need to be fully addressed in the  
8 Draft Site-wide Environmental Impact Statement.

9 I would like enough about future plans for  
10 modernization to be in there, and about what you plan to do  
11 with the extra land, so that when in the future something  
12 we can't perceive now comes up, you can do an addendum  
13 instead of having to do a whole new Site-wide Environmental  
14 Impact Statement.

15 The Draft EIS, back in 2001 had a larger  
16 section of modernization than was in the final. We were  
17 asking questions about it, so they made it smaller. And I  
18 don't think that's really the way to go, because you end up  
19 having to go through the whole process more.

20 I'd like a little discussion about what's  
21 happened since then. You know, why we changed the special  
22 material complex purification. Just a short summary so --  
23 to bring us up to date so that when we read all the  
24 alternatives and the environmental impact of each one of  
25 them, so that we can kind of know what's been going on.

1                   And because for a while after 911, we  
2                   didn't hear much of anything -- and I'm not faulting  
3                   anybody, but I think this is a public process. And I think  
4                   a better informed public can give better comments. And we  
5                   can work together as a community.

6                   I hope that I live to see the day when  
7                   there are no nuclear weapons anywhere. And there's no  
8                   rogue nations trying to develop them.

9                   But I would like to see nuclear power  
10                  generation become enabled by a life cycle where dangerous  
11                  materials can be disposed of when they are no longer  
12                  needed.

13                  Now, we haven't gotten to that... There  
14                  is surplus nuclear materials. And there are stockpiles as  
15                  it exists. And gradually, that stockpile should be reduced  
16                  as non-proliferation and weapons dismantlement takes place.

17                  And I hope that that becomes accelerated  
18                  as time goes by, and that in the future, Y-12 becomes  
19                  merely a storage facility for some of those things.  
20                  Because it can't happen overnight, because there's too much  
21                  plutonium and too much uranium.

22                  I'd also like you to talk about the report  
23                  that talks about consolidating everything in one  
24                  location -- probably out west. This was a report that was  
25                  done. I think there were five or six people -- and they

1 worked about six months on that report. And that went to  
2 the Secretary and I looked at it and they had some good  
3 ideas. But it doesn't make sense to me having everything  
4 put together. Especially after the previous Environmental  
5 Impact Statement.

6 Different skills are involved with the  
7 uranium and plutonium. And it's not good to have  
8 everything in one place, at least as far as the stockpile.

9 Also, that particular report didn't talk  
10 about consolidating the weapons laboratories. Do you  
11 realize there are three national laboratories that design  
12 and work on weapons for -- I don't know how much -- I guess  
13 all nuclear weapons...

14 Why those people looked at that and then  
15 didn't talk about consolidating the weapons labs... They  
16 just talked about consolidating the production facilities,  
17 or remanufacturing facilities.

18 And I would kind of like to see some  
19 discussion in the Draft EIS about these other things and  
20 how important they are to us -- the well-being of our  
21 nation. Thank you.

22

23

CINDY COLLINS

24

25

Thank you, Mr. Hamby, for your opening  
comments and for expressing an interest in hearing our

1 comments and allowing us to do that.

2 Good evening. My name is Cindy Collins,  
3 C-i-n-d-y C-o-l-l-i-n-s. I am from East Tennessee. And I  
4 was born here. And I have lived here all my life. I  
5 currently live in Knox County.

6 I am here this evening with my colleagues  
7 to make comments on the scope of issues to be considered in  
8 an Environmental Impact Statement on the proposed  
9 refurbishing and expansion of the Y-12 nuclear weapons  
10 plant in Oak Ridge.

11 The expansion of Y-12 is a policy based on  
12 death. Retooling of industrial plants which produces  
13 weapons of mass destruction ensures the eventual death of  
14 the planet. Spending one billion or more dollars of tax  
15 payers hard-earned money on this project, in reality,  
16 steals this money from the real needs of people now, today,  
17 and tomorrow.

18 Let's take a look at what we bury when we  
19 spend our money on this bomb plant. We would like to  
20 consider education. Consider how one billion dollars can  
21 be spent. Tennessee ranks fiftieth in the per capita  
22 revenue raised for public education, and forty-seventh in  
23 the revenue spent per capita. Since 2001, per pupil  
24 spending in constant dollars has declined by 2 percent.

25 Recently, Tennessee announced cuts in the

1 Head Start Program, which addresses educational needs of  
2 children of low-income families, who are often people of  
3 color. How could one billion dollars overcome these cuts?

4 Consider school teachers' salaries. One  
5 statistic rates the average teacher salary at about forty  
6 thousand dollars. I'm a teacher of thirteen years teaching  
7 experience, and have never seen forty thousand dollars. I  
8 have known few teachers who are making that much as well.  
9 Could Tennessee attract more and better teachers with this  
10 amount of money in its budget, rather than losing the most  
11 qualified to neighboring states such as Georgia?

12 Consider Knox County School's finances,  
13 for example. Knox County eliminated foreign language  
14 classes for elementary school students this year.  
15 Elementary school; the prime time for learning language  
16 skills. Art classes were also cut in many instances. The  
17 threat of elimination continually hangs over music programs  
18 because of lack of funding.

19 By cutting funding on the national level,  
20 our President's budget will trickle down and effectively  
21 cut more than two hundred eleven million dollars in  
22 elementary and secondary spending in Tennessee. Special  
23 education programs will lose one hundred fifty-three  
24 million. And vocational and adult education will be cut by  
25 more than one hundred nineteen million. By the way, these

1 three cuts only amount to four hundred eighty-three  
2 million, less than half of the proposed plant construction.

3           On the broader scale, consider global  
4 education. Many countries who ask for and receive aid from  
5 the United States have substandard or no existing  
6 educational systems. Could one billion plug some of these  
7 holes? Spending this gross amount of money on Y-12  
8 expansion essentially buries education.

9           I would like to express my concerns for  
10 health care and Social Security. Consider how one billion  
11 could be spent. Think about the recent TennCare cuts.  
12 Think about the almost two hundred thousand people in our  
13 communities cut from the TennCare rolls. Think about the  
14 real people who are ailing and the real people who are  
15 dying because of these cuts, which deny them health care  
16 and deny them medication. How much medication could one  
17 billion dollars buy?

18           On another note, continuing to produce  
19 weapons of mass destruction in this community will continue  
20 to increase health care burdens from workers' exposures.  
21 The use of these weapons will result in a massive health  
22 care catastrophe.

23           Additionally, the fact that we continue  
24 the arms race with this refurbishing of Y-12 means that we  
25 also share responsibility for the lack of health care

1 spending available in other countries as they feel  
2 compelled to keep pace with our nuclear production.

3 Consider also that in 2006, Medicaid  
4 funding for Tennessee will be cut by more than -- how much?  
5 One Billion. Think about how Medicaid covers our children  
6 and our elders.

7 In many societies and cultures, elders are  
8 respected, revered -- I said that wrong -- and honored.  
9 Apparently, our culture does not. We have all heard of  
10 proposed redefinitions of Social Security. It can scare  
11 all of us as we age to think that when we are at our  
12 weakest, we may also be at our least supported. Why then  
13 are these proposals to cut and to prioritize Social  
14 Security necessary when we apparently have one billion to  
15 spend on weapons of mass destruction.

16 As we continue to spend dollars on Y-12,  
17 we continue to bury people through lack of health care and  
18 through promised cuts of the Social Security programs.

19 We come to express our concern for  
20 housing. Homelessness is on the rise. In east Tennessee  
21 alone, there are about one thousand five hundred homeless  
22 persons in our area in any given month, which is a 50  
23 percent increase the last decade. As an example, servers  
24 at the meals given at the Volunteer Ministry in Knoxville  
25 have seen a marked rise in the number of people coming for

1 meals.

2                   Think about Habitat for Humanity homes.  
3 The average cost of a Habitat house is thirty-five  
4 thousand. With one billion, we could house twenty-eight  
5 thousand, five hundred seventy-one families. Repeat --  
6 twenty eight thousand, five hundred seventy-one families.

7                   If each family has only three people in  
8 it, eighty-five thousand, seven hundred fourteen people  
9 could have adequate housing.

10                  We could spend one billion on the million  
11 plus displaced people from hurricanes Katrina and Rita,  
12 instead of trying to kick them out of their FEMA-financed  
13 hotels in the dead of winter.

14                  Drive down any back country road or inner  
15 city alley and you will see examples of inadequate and  
16 substandard housing. Funding cuts in 2006 will take away  
17 rental assistance from five hundred families in Tennessee  
18 alone. Community Development programs will be cut by more  
19 than one hundred thirty. And Low Income Home Energy  
20 Assistance Program will be cut by more than two million.  
21 This one billion dollars could be allotted to alleviate  
22 these inadequacies.

23                  By spending so much money on a  
24 refurbishing plant, we're stealing from those who need  
25 homes and shelters. In effect, we are sending them to an

1 early grave.

2                   We come to express our concern for clean  
3 air and water. The historical legacy surrounding this  
4 plant and the pollution of air and water is astounding.  
5 There have been reports of losses of mercury. Poplar Creek  
6 is posted as being untouchable. These untouchable waters  
7 drain into Watts Bar Lake and the Tennessee River where you  
8 take your friends and families to fish and boat in the  
9 lake.

10                   Waste incineration continues to  
11 contaminate the air. Continuing and expanding Y-12's  
12 production of weapons of mass destruction will contribute  
13 to more contamination. There is no way to dispose of  
14 radioactive material that is safe and non-polluting,  
15 neither here nor in Nevada.

16                   We are poisoning ourselves. We are  
17 poisoning the animals. We are poisoning the birds. We are  
18 poisoning all things that rely on our environment. When we  
19 spend dollars on Y-12, we poison our air, and water, and  
20 bury ourselves.

21                   We come here to express our concern for  
22 clean land and food. Consider the increase in the  
23 occurrence of cancer in our areas where radioactivity is  
24 present. Again, we are poisoning ourselves, our animals,  
25 our ecosystem.

1                   We must also consider the cost to the  
2 environment of the potential use of these weapons. Not  
3 only will there be massive devastation as exemplified at  
4 Hiroshima and Nagasaki, but the long-term effects are  
5 phenomenal.

6                   This Environmental Impact Statement should  
7 address not only the impact of an additional plant, but the  
8 impact of the use of these weapons. How will the product  
9 of this plant effect the environment where it is used?

10                  Consider the Chernobyl incident. Much of  
11 the surrounding countryside is unusable and off limits.  
12 Foodstuffs for the world market such as tomatoes and apples  
13 grown in Eastern Europe have shown evidence of radioactive  
14 contamination.

15                  For those unlucky ones who subsist on the  
16 land in the area around Chernobyl who have no choice but to  
17 raise what they eat and eat what they raise, these people  
18 are literally eating themselves to death.

19                  We in the United States, we in Tennessee,  
20 we in Oak Ridge, bear the responsibility for the protection  
21 of our land and food. If we spend one billion on  
22 additional nuclear weapon refurbishment, we are hastening  
23 our own trip to the graveyard.

24                  We are here to express our concern to the  
25 right to livelihood. The right to livelihood means the

1 chance to have a job that contributes towards the  
2 well-being of the planet while also providing for one's  
3 family. What is the cost to individuals when they are  
4 forced to choose between a job that pushes us to the brink  
5 of death, and providing living wages for their families?  
6 People choose every day to work at hazardous jobs in order  
7 to feed themselves and their families. This is not a fair  
8 choice.

9                   This proposal of a refurbishing plant  
10 looks rosy in the short term. Lots and lots of contractors  
11 and subcontractors will find work on a short-term basis  
12 until the project is finished. Then what? The long-term  
13 objective is to upgrade the facilities and in effect  
14 downsize the permanent workforce. How does this maintain a  
15 healthy economy?

16                   This proposal contains three options which  
17 we can all read about. What if there were a fourth? Close  
18 the Y-12 Plant and stop production or refurbishing of  
19 nuclear weapons altogether. This proposal could very  
20 possibly provide the healthiest local economy of any of the  
21 options.

22                   Estimates suggest that a thirty-year lead  
23 time would be necessary to reconfigure the workforce. This  
24 means thirty years of more or less guaranteed employment.  
25 These figures do not consider the jobs necessary for

1 cleanup of the mess that we have made.

2                   When people are denied the possibility of  
3 right to livelihood, they are doomed. Their families are  
4 doomed.

5                   We are here to express our concern for  
6 healthy people and animals. People and animals suffer from  
7 the presence of Y-12 and the bomb building that happens  
8 here. Physical suffering occurs from the contamination of  
9 plants and animals; geese, deer, frogs, and more, which  
10 wander far from the bounds of the Oak Ridge Reservation.  
11 There are instances of sick workers. There are other  
12 instances of sick community members. What will be the  
13 impact of adding to that burden?

14                   What other forms of sickness exist in  
15 those communities from an economy that is based on death?  
16 What is the psychological cost of working at a plant which  
17 creates the destruction of our planet? What is the cost of  
18 fear and insecurity of living and working near or in a  
19 facility guarded against terrorists?

20                   We have schools full of our children  
21 within arm's reach of the existing plant; yet we propose to  
22 increase their danger.

23                   What are the costs of producing weapons of  
24 mass destruction? We experience psychological numbing, a  
25 playing out of racist and elitist policies, an extreme

1 financial burden to the nation. Are we willing to bury our  
2 health by building this plant?

3 We come here to express our concern to  
4 international law. Consider the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

5 What is the effect on the rest of the  
6 world when we announce that, No, we are not going to reduce  
7 our nuclear stockpile and progress toward non-proliferation  
8 as we pledged in 1970, but we are going to retool and  
9 rebuild what we have so that we have a greater capacity  
10 than before.

11 An international treaty by the  
12 U.S. Constitution is the highest law in the land. We keep  
13 breaking our own laws.

14 We have gone to war with Iraq, supposedly  
15 over weapons of mass destruction, which even now our own  
16 President admits did not exist, while we refurbish weapons  
17 of mass destruction in our own back yards. We made threats  
18 to Iran and North Korea for producing nuclear weapons.  
19 Meanwhile, we supply Israel and India with parts for their  
20 production of nuclear facilities.

21 How long will we be a nation that relies  
22 on policies of death and fear to hold power? Will we ever  
23 lead by example rather than by force?

24 Building this proposed plant inters  
25 internal law and the NNPT into an ignominious grave.

1                   We come to express our concern for global  
2 stability. With every weapon that Y-12 rebuilds, with  
3 every plan for new weapons design and manufacturing, with a  
4 massive upgrade of Y-12, and plans for a plutonium facility  
5 in South Carolina, our government pushed the other nations  
6 of the world closer to the use of nuclear weapons.

7                   Nuclear weapons do not understand the  
8 world as a separate geopolitical unit. Instead, they see  
9 the world as it is from space; a planet with interconnected  
10 water, land, air, people, animals, and plants. It is a  
11 planet where the fate of one depends on the fate of all.  
12 It is a global family from the nuclear perspective. We  
13 cannot and do not live in isolation when thinking in terms  
14 of nuclear weaponry.

15                   Every hammer blow used to build this plant  
16 drives another nail in the coffin of global security.

17                   We come here to express concern for our  
18 children's future. The children of the world look to the  
19 adults present here and ask for a chance to live. They ask  
20 for futures in which they can grow old and have their own  
21 families. They ask for the opportunity live where they can  
22 pursue ideals such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of  
23 happiness. Where is our passion? Where is our concern for  
24 the children of the world? Where is our love for our own  
25 children?

1                   We will spend up their future, squander  
2 their resources, poison the planet, and pursue policies  
3 that endanger them as part of the human race. Will we bury  
4 our children's future by building this project? Will --  
5 will death have the final word? Thank you.

6

7

ANNE HABLAS

8

Good evening. My name is Anne Hablas,

9

A-n-n-e H-a-b-l-a-s.

10

As a Christian, and as a U.S. citizen, I

11

want to join with all those who are here today, and who

12

have so eloquently already stated, "stop the bomb making."

13

I want to say "No" to building weapons of

14

mass destruction. These weapons, their production, and

15

threat to use, have been condemned by numerous religious

16

leaders as incompatible with the peace that we seek for the

17

21st Century.

18

I want to say "No" to spending millions

19

for a new bomb plant at the expense of badly needed social

20

programs such as Head Start, health care, housing -- as has

21

been so eloquently displayed and mimed for us.

22

"No" to building a new plant and more

23

bombs in violation of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty,

24

all the while invoking this treaty against North Korea and

25

Iran.



1 for Halloween, or Thanksgiving, or put off until  
2 Valentine's Day.

3                   It is a recognized fact that nuclear  
4 weapons are instruments of death and mass destruction. We  
5 have witnessed their potency with the U.S. bombing of  
6 Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Bombs release immense quantities  
7 of heat and energy, and also powerful and prolonged  
8 radiation. Their destructive power cannot be contained in  
9 space or time.

10                   I reject the No Action Plan and all the  
11 alternatives for both proposed by the NNSA for Y-12,  
12 because they support the production of bombs that have the  
13 potential to destroy all civilization and the entire  
14 ecosystem of the planet.

15                   At this time of year, many people are  
16 remembering the birth of Jesus, sometimes called the Prince  
17 of Peace. Nuclear weapons are built for war and not for  
18 peace. The DOE claims that the bombs now being refurbished  
19 at Y-12 are certified reliable for one hundred to one  
20 hundred twenty years. This means we're building bombs for  
21 the 22nd Century. And right now, we are only five years  
22 into the 21st Century.

23                   What does this mean for our children and  
24 grandchildren? Will they ever know peace?

25                   I reject the No Action Plan and all of the

1 alternatives proposed by the NNSA for Y-12 because they  
2 move us closer to war instead of closer to peace.

3           On December 10th, just five days ago, we  
4 celebrated Human Rights Day. The exorbitant amount of  
5 taxpayer money spent for the production of nuclear weapons  
6 and proposed for the modernization of the Y-12 Plant does  
7 not seem to be in the best interest of security for this  
8 country.

9           For true national security, there must be  
10 adequate funds for quality education, necessary food,  
11 decent and affordable housing, developmental child care,  
12 and accessible health care. I believe that the basic  
13 social needs of our nation are being held hostage by the  
14 excessive expenditures for nuclear weapons.

15           I reject the No Action Plan and all the  
16 alternatives proposed by the NNSA for Y-12, because the  
17 basic social needs of our nation are being held hostage by  
18 excessive expenditures for nuclear weapons.

19           We are all, each and every one of us,  
20 responsible for clean air, pure water, life-giving soil,  
21 all living beings, and all the valuable resources of Earth.

22           There is a sense of well-being that comes  
23 from recognition of our place within the web of life and  
24 our responsibility to appreciate and protect it.

25           I reject the No Action Plan and all the

1 alternatives proposed by the NNSA because of Y-12's history  
2 of handling waste materials and environmental pollution.

3 I suggest that the Y-12 nuclear production  
4 facility be closed. Talking about closing the Y-12 Plant  
5 often bring cries of "What about the jobs?" If the present  
6 job force were transferred from making bombs to dismantling  
7 bombs, credible sources report there will be plenty of work  
8 to do and no jobs lost.

9 I reject the No Action Plan and all the  
10 alternatives proposed by the NNSA, and propose that the  
11 Y-12 Nuclear Production Facility be closed immediately, and  
12 Y-12 pursue it's neglected mission of dismantling and  
13 disposing of nuclear weapons.

14 With bomb production at Y-12, the United  
15 States, through the Department of Energy, is disregarding  
16 the obligations of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.  
17 The United States sets itself above international law with  
18 the production of nuclear weapons and holds a double  
19 standard with regard to other countries producing nuclear  
20 weapons.

21 I reject the No Action Plan and all of the  
22 alternatives proposed by the NNSA because the United States  
23 is violating international law by making bombs at Y-12.

24 Over the years, there have been numerous  
25 media reports of serious safety criticality breaches and

1 grave security infringements at the Y-12 Nuclear Weapons  
2 Plant.

3 I reject the No Action Plan and all the  
4 alternatives proposed by the NNSA because of a lack of  
5 transparency that could "significantly affect the quality  
6 of the environment."

7 In closing, I propose the Site-wide EIS  
8 give serious consideration to adding another alternative to  
9 the No Action Plan and the three alternatives proposed by  
10 the NNSA.

11 This Alternative No. 5 would call for  
12 ceasing nuclear weapon production at Y-12 immediately. The  
13 benefits of implementing this Alternative No. 5 would  
14 outweigh all costs.

15 As a nation, we would have the resources  
16 available to meet the basic social resources of our nation  
17 and protect the valuable resources of Earth. The United  
18 States would be acknowledged for its credible initiatives  
19 for nuclear disarmament. The United States would also be  
20 recognized as a world leader acting on high moral  
21 principles.

22 I believe Alternative No. 5 is the only  
23 proposal that moves us closer to peace in our world. Thank  
24 you.

25



1 might be in Syria, perhaps. Maybe they are in Afghanistan  
2 or maybe Iraq. Really, I doubt that. It seems that Iraq  
3 really has nothing except oil wells.

4                   The simple point is, you know, what are we  
5 going to retaliate against with this huge stockpile that we  
6 are trying to build? I mean, the last time, at 911, they  
7 had cells operating in Florida and Texas. Are we going to  
8 bomb them?

9                   We need to spend our time and our money  
10 tracking down nuclear materials. You can't hide a nuclear  
11 weapons production facility. You just simply can't do it.

12                   You can speak to someone like Scott Ritter  
13 who was in Iraq and said that there were no weapons of mass  
14 destruction in Iraq before we started; that you can sit  
15 down and track them down. Which simply points out that the  
16 U.N. program of inspections works.

17                   And I would like to see that this  
18 facility, as well as every other facility on the planet, be  
19 opened for inspection -- the silos out in Nebraska, or  
20 wherever, where we actually have the bombs. It's not  
21 giving away the location of our nuclear submarines.

22                   This is opening the facility up to U.N.  
23 inspections, just like everyone else, to show that we will  
24 take as good as we give; that the United States will hold  
25 to its commitments and have some integrity for a change, so

1 when we sign a treaty, someone will believe what we say.

2 And that's all I would like to say. My  
3 name is Martin Stephens, spelled with a P-H. And I'm  
4 interested about our national security.

5

6 ERIK JOHNSON

7 My name is Erik Johnson, spelled E-r-i-k  
8 J-o-h-n-s-o-n. I live in Maryville. My wife, Libby, is  
9 here with me. We have five children. And when "Death"  
10 moved over us in this space, it made my skin crawl. Kevin  
11 radiated through his acting "Death."

12 When I go to the Y-12 gates, I feel death.  
13 And when we talk about... I'm here to reject this plan of  
14 the NNSA. And I'm here to say that the Site-wide  
15 Environmental Impact Statement -- site-wide cannot be  
16 localized just here in Oak Ridge or under the grounds of  
17 the Y-12 Nuclear Weapons Plant. It takes in the whole  
18 world. The whole planet.

19 I'm grateful for the courage of Kacey, who  
20 came before us. Her brother, Will, is here. And Emma and  
21 Sara Margaret are sisters. So we need to bring into their  
22 presence all their sisters and brothers -- they are  
23 children of the world. We're approaching six billion  
24 people on this planet. They are affected by this  
25 initiative.

1                   Also, the Ponderosa pine, all the  
2 salamander species in the Great Smoky Mountains, all the  
3 whales, all the marching penguins, and the flying geese.  
4 They need to come to this hearing. They are here. And I'm  
5 bringing them here for you to hear. I want you to feel  
6 that because you're my brothers and sisters. And you are  
7 brothers and sisters to all the people that share this  
8 planet, and all the leaping, and jumping, and swimming  
9 creatures, and flying ones, too. They're affected by this.

10                   We're not talking about something that's  
11 going to happen. We're really already talking about the  
12 capability presently of these weapons that have been  
13 refurbished to unleash fire storms across the globe. They  
14 are speeding away and sweeping all human kind, all life,  
15 into a sterile hell.

16                   And I'm here to stand and say "No" to  
17 that. "No" to what we already have manufactured and are  
18 maintaining and are refurbishing. And it makes no sense to  
19 me. It's insane. It's madness to talk about building upon  
20 that legacy of horror, and terror, and death making, by  
21 building new ones. There's such an abhorrence to  
22 international law, to our treaties, to our own  
23 Constitution.

24                   What I invite those decision-makers in  
25 this room, in any way that you can impact and influence

1 other decision-makers, to seize hope. Hope that embraces  
2 the riches of love, and justice, and peace, for all human  
3 kind, because we're all traveling together on this globe;  
4 and for our human life, for our plant life, and animal  
5 life; for the water, for the air, for the very Earth. It  
6 makes no sense. And I don't understand why we have to come  
7 and even talk about this.

8 I remember years ago it was pointed out  
9 that it's like we're standing in a room full of gasoline.  
10 And only one match would set it ablaze.

11 Where we're standing, the whole Earth is  
12 saturated with this madness. And we have enough weapons  
13 presently, with the few that we already have. It's  
14 interesting on the kitchen matches, it says: Keep away  
15 from children. Well, the children are going to be impacted  
16 by these weapons. So if this room were filled with  
17 gasoline, and the whole Earth, and we unleash just one  
18 match...

19 I thank sister Anne Hablas, sister Mary  
20 Dennis, Glenda Keys, and Marcus, and Cindy Collins, and  
21 Kacey. It seems like we have a monopoly already. And  
22 others who have acquiesced who want to speak against this  
23 weapon, to listen to us and act upon what you have heard,  
24 and what you have seen, and hopefully what you have felt  
25 here tonight; that we can embrace a hope that leans into

1 the strength of justice and peace. Not only for our own  
2 selves and for our own nation, but for the global family of  
3 which we're a part. Amen.

4

5

RALPH HUTCHISON

6

7

8

I had an idea this afternoon for a good  
presentation, but I didn't have time to work it up. But it  
started out:

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

T'was the night before Christmas,  
When all through Oak Ridge,  
Not a creature was stirring, not even a smidge,  
Except for those folks with an EIS to prepare,  
In hopes Uncle Sam would build a new bomb plant there.

I want to say thanks for the extension of  
the comment period. To the folks who are responsible for  
that, I want to say thank you for modifying the format of  
the meeting so that people would have a chance to speak  
publically.

And I also want to say that I appreciate,  
Mr. Hamby, this morning, your response to my question that  
you wanted comments on all of the Environmental Impact  
Statement, including the purpose and the need. And I think  
a lot of what you have heard here this evening is about the  
purpose and the need for a new facility proposed for  
Oak Ridge.

1                   Usually, or oftentimes, we don't get a  
2 chance to have a full public discussion until the Draft EIS  
3 is published. And by then, we're told it's too late to  
4 talk about the purpose and the need and that that call has  
5 already been made.

6                   The last time the Department of Energy  
7 prepared a Site-wide Environmental Impact Statement for  
8 Y-12 was the first time. And that Site-wide Environmental  
9 Impact Statement was predicated on the fact that -- the  
10 belief that our country needed to maintain a nuclear  
11 arsenal of six thousand warheads. That need provided the  
12 justification for two new facilities.

13                   And during the hearing, we made comments  
14 much like the ones you heard tonight, that noted that the  
15 United States was actually committed to downsizing its  
16 nuclear arsenal; in general by the Nuclear  
17 Non-Proliferation Treaty, and in particular by our Arms  
18 Control Agreement.

19                   At that time, the Department of Energy  
20 chose to dismiss our comments because they could. And they  
21 plowed ahead with an EIS that justified facilities to meet  
22 the requirements of a six- to nine-thousand-warhead  
23 arsenal.

24                   Later, of course, as we read and heard  
25 about the modifications, DOE backtracked to downsize its

1 plans based on the commitments that we had pointed out in  
2 the opening rounds of this earlier EIS.

3 Now, imagine a world in which the United  
4 States meets its treaty obligations. Imagine our nuclear  
5 arsenal being downsized to seventeen hundred warheads by  
6 2012, as George Bush has committed to Vladimir Putin we  
7 will do. Imagine -- this might seem far fetched -- but  
8 imagine we keep our word and meet our NPT obligations of no  
9 new weapons production.

10 Imagine, we come to see the truth of what  
11 Nobel Peace Prize winner Mohammed ElBaradei said, when he  
12 pointed out that the Stockpile Life Extension Program is  
13 inconsistent with our treaty obligations.

14 In this imaginary world -- and I dare to  
15 suggest that outside of the community of Oak Ridge, and  
16 maybe the White House -- it's more real than the wishing  
17 world this EIS is living in. What is the justification for  
18 a billion dollar bomb plant? How is it that we need this  
19 bomb plant?

20 David Hobson, Republican,  
21 Ultra-conservative right wing Republican Chair of the House  
22 Energy and Water Appropriations Subcommittee said yesterday  
23 about new nuclear weapons production... He said, "Our  
24 whole weapons complex is still in the Cold War, and the  
25 Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator, in my opinion, is a prime

1 example of living in the past and not the future. If  
2 you're going to be a leader in the world, I don't think you  
3 can go out and propose a whole new weapon and then tell  
4 everybody else, "Don't do it."

5                   Hobson didn't say a whole new bomb plant  
6 because he's probably not fully aware of the plans that are  
7 being hatched here today. But I ask then; if David Hobson  
8 makes a statement like this, is it reasonable to consider  
9 an alternative in which the United States meets its treaty  
10 obligations in which Y-12 ceases production activity, and  
11 life extension activity, and embraces its long neglected  
12 mission of dismantlement?

13                   Is it reasonable to consider an  
14 alternative in which the U.S. downsizes its arsenal as we  
15 promised in Article 6 of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation  
16 Treaty in pursuit of complete disarmament?

17                   If that is reasonable, the Draft EIS  
18 should look a great deal at what we are calling  
19 Alternative 5. It certainly falls within the range  
20 specified by NEPA -- the whole of human environment.

21                   This EIS is late in coming. The horse has  
22 left the barn. The horse is on the track. For all we  
23 know, the gates have opened. DOE is providing us no  
24 information, really, about this process.

25                   What we do know is that DOE has made a

1 decision to do this Critical Decision Zero that we read  
2 about. We don't know what Critical Decision One is. I  
3 understand it's been reached, but we haven't been told what  
4 it is. Both of those decisions were made absent  
5 consideration of environmental impact.

6                   How can we participate in this in an  
7 informed and meaningful way? The Department of Energy has  
8 yet to provide OREPA with information that we requested  
9 under the Freedom of Information Act in 2001, or even to  
10 issue us a letter of denial so that we could appeal the  
11 ruling.

12                   We intend to press our right to this  
13 information. If we have to, we'll go to Court. If DOE  
14 cannot provide the information in a timely manner before  
15 the close of this comment period, we will move to restrain  
16 further work on the EIS for the facilities proposed until  
17 legitimate FOIA requests are filled. Five years is plenty  
18 of time. I think we can persuade a judge of that.

19                   I also want to say that this EIS, at least  
20 at this point, in what you've revealed in the Federal  
21 Register notice, appears to be improperly limited in scope.  
22 It does not consider alternative sites.

23                   The July 2005 Report of the Nuclear  
24 Weapons Complex Infrastructure Task Force's Recommendations  
25 for the Nuclear Weapons Complex of the Future, that Barbara

1 referred to here, calls for consolidations of weapons  
2 processes and facilities in a single site.

3 I wouldn't say whether or not I agree with  
4 that without being able to read the full report. But  
5 surely, a report prepared at this level of government, the  
6 Secretary of Energy's Advisory Board, which should be  
7 considered underneath NEPA.

8 This EIS, which presumes that Oak Ridge is  
9 the only site for a new enriched uranium facility, is too  
10 narrow in scope.

11 The EIS must also calculate cost to the  
12 whole of the human environment. The EIS not only considers  
13 direct environmental impact, but also indirect  
14 environmental impact. And it is clear that in Oak Ridge,  
15 as across the rest of the nuclear weapons complex,  
16 production money competes with cleanup dollars. It's  
17 always been true. It's still true.

18 A billion dollars to build a new bomb  
19 plant is a billion dollars not available to clean up old  
20 messes, which we have plenty of.

21 The Environmental Impact Statement should  
22 address, especially Y-12 Site-wide, should address the  
23 conditions of East Fork Poplar Creek and the failure to  
24 clean up East Fork Poplar Creek; now more than twenty years  
25 since we first learned of its contamination.

1                   Here's language from the Y-12 Water Permit  
2                   that was supposed to be completed by now, but it wasn't.  
3                   It hasn't been completed yet. Y-12 operates on a water  
4                   permit that's more than five years past its expiration date  
5                   right now. But this is in the current water permit:

6                   "Ongoing CERCLA cleanup actions and  
7                   surface water monitoring programs indicate ambient water  
8                   quality criteria were exceeded in 2003 for mercury.  
9                   Ambient water quality criteria were exceeded in 2003 for  
10                  mercury, nickel, thallium, and numerous volatile organic  
11                  compounds. Heavy metal concentrations exceeded the human  
12                  health risk criteria for arsenic, beryllium, cadmium,  
13                  manganese and uranium. Radionuclides exceeded those same  
14                  criteria for technetium-99 and uranium isotopes."

15                  That's in the current Draft Water Permit.  
16                  It's less than six months old.

17                  The water permit also says: "Current  
18                  effluents, plus historic releases and stormwater discharges  
19                  continue to cause serious water quality impacts."

20                  And finally -- this amazed me most of  
21                  all -- the permit says: Mercury concentrations in  
22                  Outfall 200, shown in Appendix 4 of the Water Permit, are  
23                  above 0.0002mg/l, or 200 parts-per-trillion since 1999, and  
24                  increasing -- and increasing.

25                  Mercury concentrations in Outfall 200 are

1 increasing to a current level of approximately one thousand  
2 parts-per-trillion in recent data. That's a five-fold  
3 increase since 1999 in East Fork Poplar Creek.

4 All is not well with East Fork Poplar  
5 Creek. And according to the state, it is getting worse,  
6 not better. The EIS, I think, has to address the rising  
7 levels of mercury over the last several years and explain  
8 this to the public. Nobody was able to at the Water Permit  
9 meeting.

10 And the reason we haven't had a follow-up  
11 briefing is because they still haven't figured out what to  
12 say to the public about that. But the EIS must address  
13 this as part of the physical environment at Y-12 before you  
14 embark on a new polluting facility.

15 The EIS must also address the cost to  
16 community growth. Being the host of a huge facility that  
17 produces weapons of mass destruction does not encourage  
18 healthy economic growth in a community. It's not a selling  
19 point, say, if you're trying to recruit a new manufacturer  
20 to open a plant here.

21 How much does it cost us to have a bomb  
22 plant operating in our community? The EIS should look at  
23 these socioeconomic factors. They are part of your table  
24 of contents. So look at these numbers.

25 The EIS must also calculate health cost to

1 workers. The age of denial is over. Over the last five  
2 years the payouts to past workers, long overdue and grossly  
3 inadequate, have given the lie to assurances over the years  
4 that nobody was ever harmed by contamination here.

5                   What are the estimates for health impacts  
6 and payouts to future workers at a new highly enriched  
7 uranium, beryllium, lithium plant?

8                   The Environmental Impact Statement must  
9 also address the increased risk of catastrophic attack.  
10 This is the reality in today's world. When a nation  
11 builds, or threatens to build, or even is believed to maybe  
12 be building facilities of mass destruction, that nation and  
13 that facility may be attacked.

14                   It's not necessarily the position of the  
15 United Nations, I grant you. But it is the position of the  
16 United States. And it's not just a theoretical position.  
17 We have justified a war of aggression and a hostile  
18 occupation of another nation, precisely, according to our  
19 leaders, because they were pursuing production of weapons  
20 of mass destruction. Exactly -- exactly what we are  
21 talking about doing here tonight. My God, who do we think  
22 we are?

23                   By any theory of justice that the United  
24 States of America can defend, it is perfectly legitimate  
25 for any other nation, maybe any other group, to undertake

1 an attack on the United States of America.

2 Their justification, the bombing of Oak  
3 Ridge, would ultimately weigh out as far more solid than  
4 ours. We continue to bomb a country on a mistaken  
5 suspicion. But if anybody decides to come after us, it  
6 will be on the certain knowledge that we are producing  
7 weapons of mass destruction.

8 So the EIS must consider that Oak Ridge,  
9 as it constructs and operates the newest facility for the  
10 proliferation of nuclear weapons of mass destruction, may  
11 well be targeted by terrorists or other nations who are  
12 committed to nuclear proliferation.

13 This is not a low-probability/low-risk  
14 scenario. And when I looked at the handout that's on the  
15 back table there, and I saw an above-ground facility in the  
16 sketch there. This is clearly not a consideration that's  
17 being taken seriously by the Department of Energy as it  
18 makes these plans.

19 But really, why care about the environment  
20 at all? Why not sacrifice this place and maybe some of the  
21 good people who work here for the greater good?

22 If nuclear weapons are absolutely  
23 essential for the security of our country, if we have to  
24 have them, if we need this bomb plant because we've got to  
25 have the bombs; why calculate any of these lesser costs?

1                   It's crass to suggest we would do it just  
2 because the law requires; isn't it? But it's idealistic to  
3 suggest it is because we have values that are higher than  
4 security at all costs. Still, I think we've got to choose.

5                   I'll choose the latter. I believe that  
6 some things -- I believe that the destruction of a  
7 life-supporting environment, the sacrifice of workers, and  
8 public health and safety, are valued, at least enough in  
9 our society, that we must do the calculation. That's why  
10 we do the Environmental Impact Statement. We've got to do  
11 the calculation.

12                   Possibly, these things are valued even  
13 enough that we will make a decision based on that  
14 calculation -- virtually unheard of. But at the very  
15 least, the exercise of the calculation comes under the  
16 heading "the whole of the human environment."

17                   Are there other values in play here? Keep  
18 our word? Treaty obligations? Obeying the law of the  
19 land? I think good solid people in East Tennessee value  
20 those things.

21                   The courts here in Anderson County, the  
22 local courts, tell us that these concerns are too big for  
23 them. Sometimes it seems that folks around here don't want  
24 to believe that what we do here in Oak Ridge is big stuff.  
25 We are providing leadership to the world.

1                   I believe there are other values, part of  
2 the whole of human environment. I believe in the value of  
3 integrity. I believe the value we place on the social  
4 programs, when money is poured down the nuclear weapons  
5 rathole; Head Start Programs, housing, health care, food --  
6 you name it. As long as we spend forty billion dollars a  
7 year on nuclear weapons in this country, we won't have the  
8 funds for programs that provide real security, over the  
9 long haul, for the people of the United States of America.

10                   I urge the Department of Energy to  
11 consider Alternative 5. If you're serious about addressing  
12 the public's concerns that you hear about in the scoping  
13 process, it is a reasonable alternative. It has the virtue  
14 of a positive environmental impact in every conceivable  
15 way. And it has the further benefit of being morally  
16 defensible. It will provide for a robust local economy.  
17 It meets our treaty commitments and our legal obligations.  
18 And it provides a real world leadership on  
19 nonproliferation. And it also points toward true security  
20 for the U.S. and for the citizens of the world.

21                   This is Alternative 5, and it is very  
22 short: Cease weapons production activities at Y-12.  
23 Pursue the neglected dismantlement and disposition mission  
24 and only those activities necessary to safely fulfill this  
25 mission. Construct a new, safeguarded, zero-emission

1 facility with built-in transparency -- international  
2 transparency.

3 Bring in the IAEA. That's what we want  
4 them to do everywhere else in the world. Bring them in  
5 here. Let us let them watch us disassemble and dismantle  
6 our nuclear weapons and dispose of the materials.

7 I would add to it, declare  
8 Manhattan Project 2 dedicated to finding solutions to  
9 long-term contamination dilemmas we have here in Oak Ridge.  
10 I think we should use Oak Ridge's long history of service  
11 to the nation, and the clear evidence of need, to leverage  
12 funds for thorough cleanup and responsible long-term  
13 management of legacy wastes here in Oak Ridge.

14 I realize that what I'm suggesting in my  
15 comments is not the way the Department of Energy plans to  
16 go. I realize people have already made decisions about how  
17 the Draft EIS is going to come out. If you think you're  
18 going to have it done this summer, you've probably already  
19 got the outline and half the document written.

20 But I think tonight is the opportunity for  
21 people to step up. Every one of us in this room has the  
22 responsibility to try to build the kind of world we want  
23 our kids to grow up in. Nobody gets off the hook by  
24 saying, It's just my job.

25 You have a responsibility. Think about

1 this when you go home tonight. I urge you to take this  
2 opportunity to step up and be the kind of person you can be  
3 proud of in front of Kacey Collin, or the other children  
4 who are here in the room, or your own children and  
5 grandchildren. Thank you.

6 (END OF PUBLIC COMMENTS.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## 1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2

3 STATE OF TENNESSEE )

4 COUNTY OF BLOUNT )

5

6 I, DANA HOLLOWAY, Court Reporter and Notary Public, in  
7 and for the County of Blount, State of Tennessee at Large, do  
8 hereby certify:

9 That I reported the public comments on December 15,  
10 2005, for the DOE-NNSA Site-wide Environmental Impact Statement  
11 Scoping Meeting, held at the Department of Energy Information  
12 Center, 475 Oak Ridge Turnpike, in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, and  
13 that the foregoing transcript is a true and accurate record of  
14 said public comments to the best of my knowledge, skills, and  
15 ability.

16 I further certify that I am not kin to any of the  
17 parties involved therein nor their counsel, and I have no  
18 financial or otherwise interest in the outcome of these  
19 proceedings whatsoever.

20 This the 22nd day of December, 2005.

21

22

---

Dana Holloway, Court Reporter

23

24 My Commission Expires: July 11, 2006

25