J., Shelby
Page 1 of 2

Draft Site-wide Environmental Impact Statement for Continued Operation of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory and Supplemental Stockpile Stewardship and Management Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
U.S. Department of Energy
National Nuclear Security Administration

National Nuclear Security Administration

(V)

Written Comment Form

Must be received on or before May 27, 2004.

To = Decision Makers -
concerning these issues
From = Shelby J
former treasurer of
Sacramento Peace Action

Thank you - for this
chance for dialogue;

Congratulations on your
devotion to scientific matters
- I myself received 3rd
place in our Midwestern
Science Fair -

Please use other side if more space is needed.

Comment forms may be mailed to:
Mr. Tom Grim
Document Manager
National Nuclear Security Administration
Livermore Site Office, L-293
7000 East Avenue
Livermore, CA 94550-9234

Comment forms may be faxed to:
Mr. Tom Grim
(925) 422-1776

NO COMMENTS IDENTIFIED IN THIS SUBMITTAL

J., Shelby
Page 2 of 2

I echo the call for
'environmental Justice'

Jackson, Janet F.
Page 1 of 1

-----Original Message-----
From: janet f jackson [mailto:janslot@sonic.net]
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2004 3:01 PM
To: tom.grim@oak.doe.gov
Subject: Nuclear Weapons

1/04.01 I am very disturbed that our Congress has allowed the Bush administration to step up the building of nuclear weapons. The danger of nuclear proliferation is well known, and any threats to our country surely do not justify the blatant waste of tax revenues for such an endeavor. It is an absurd twist of logic to argue that we will be safer with increased nuclear weapon buildup.

2/01.01 Please take my comments to heart. sincerely, Janet F. Jackson

2301 Silk Rd.
Windsor, CA

95492

Joan
Page 1 of 1

From: "joan peace" <lifeissacred2004@yahoo.com>
To: tom.grim@oak.doe.gov
Subject: Please care about the health of the world
Date: Fri, 28 May 2004 11:07:28 -0700

Hello,
I am writing you with the hope that you will consider the health of all of the plants, animals (including humans), and Earth itself, now and for future generations, in your decision-making. There is nothing safe about nuclear anything, ever. I beg of you to please, please, please, consider this as you make your decisions. I personally would like to one day bring a child into this world and there is already so much nuclear activity to clean up.
Thank you, in peace, Joan

NO COMMENTS IDENTIFIED IN THIS SUBMITTAL

Judge, Jane
Page 1 of 1

-----Original Message-----
From: Janeejudge@aol.com [mailto:Janeejudge@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2004 5:18 AM
To: tom.grim@oak.doe.gov
Subject: No Doe Plan

Let's stop the insanity now. Otherwise, world destruction.

Jane Judge

NO COMMENTS IDENTIFIED IN THIS SUBMITTAL

Junell, Greg
Page 1 of 1

Greg Junell
752 Islay
San Luis Obispo, Ca 93401

May 18, 2004

Mr. Tom Grim
DOE, NNSA L-293
7000 East Ave.
Livermore, CA 94550

Re: LLNL Should Work for Peaceful Purposes

Dear Mr. Grim:

1/02.01 I oppose the development of nuclear weapons at LLNL. Please consider that the best interest of the people of the world and the citizens of the United States is peace.

Peace does not come from weapons. Peace comes from communication.

2/07.01 The best use of the excellent facilities and find minds at LLNL is for civilian R&D, declassified projects and peaceful endeavors.

Most Sincerely,

Greg Junell

Kate-Turner, Janis
Page 1 of 2

May 25, 2004

To: Thomas Grim, Document Manager
US Dept of Energy

Dear Mr. Grim:

1/33.01 I live less than 1 mile from LLNL main site. I am very concerned about the proposed increase of on-site storage & use of plutonium (from current limit of 1,540 lbs to an allowable 3,500 lbs) as stated in the recently released SWEIS, which outlines operations for LLNL and Site 300 over the next 10 years.

2/26.01 The use of plutonium in fission & vaporizing experiments as planned at the National Ignition Facility is irresponsible in the midst of a tightly packed residential community.

3/24.04 Testing by an independent contractor (TRAC lab out of Bilfair, Wa.) reports nuclear by-products of fission downwind and downstream from LLNL main site: (Strontium 90, Americum 241, Cesium 237.

4/23.01 I live downstream near Arroyo Seco and Big Trees Park, where elevated levels of plutonium have been reported. Thank you,

Kate-Turner, Janis
Page 2 of 2

4/23.01 cont. "What will be done to protect my neighborhood from further nuclear contamination in the face of proposed acceleration of experiments with nuclear elements?"

5/33.01 Next, I ask, "How will the used plutonium & nuclear by-products be disposed of? Currently, no facility is able or willing to receive LLNL radioactive wastes; do you have a plan for repository other than storage at LLNL?

Please respond to my questions and concerns.

Respectfully,

Janis Kate-Turner
749 Hazel St
Livermore, Ca
94550

Katz, Joanna
Page 1 of 1

-----Original Message-----
From: Joanna Katz [mailto:jbkatz@lmi.net]
Sent: Tuesday, May 04, 2004 4:11 PM
To: tom.grim@oak.doe.gov
Subject: Livermore Lab

1/37.01 It would be a disaster to revive the manufacture of nuclear weapons at Livermore.

2/22.02 1) With any use of nuclear anything there is a huge problem of how to dispose of the waste. If this does not immediately impact us, it will eventually destroy us as the waste accumulates and it becomes harder and harder to find safe storage for the deadly stuff.

3/02.01 2) Building nuclear weapons of any kind is not where we want to put our resources. We approach conflict with diplomacy and negotiation, not with the mentality of who can be the most destructive.

4/30.01 3) With the manufacture of more nuclear weapons, Livermore would become a perfect target for a terrorist attack.

5/07.01 Research and planning should be going into cleaning up Livermore, and making it a resource for peaceful purposes.

Joanna Katz, Berkeley
--

Kendrick, Daniel
Page 1 of 2

From: "Daniel Kendrick" <dlkeck@ix.netcom.com>
To: "Mr.Tom Grim" <tom.grim@oak.doe.gov>
Subject: My comments on new programs being proposed at Livermore Lab
Date: Sat, 22 May 2004 22:08:54 -0700

Daniel Kendrick
4274 Fairlands Dr
Pleasanton, CA 94588

May 23, 2004

Mr. Tom Grim
DOE, NNSA L-293
7000 East Ave.
Livermore, CA 94550

Dear Mr. Grim:

Please consider this letter with my comments on the environmental and proliferation risks from proposed nuclear weapons development and new plutonium and tritium programs at the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL).

I moved to the Tri-Valley area about 10 years ago. My children attended school in Livermore and Pleasanton.

I have some comments about Department of Energy's Site-Wide Environmental Impact Statement for continued Operations at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL). I attended the public hearings on the subject held on April 27, 2004 in Livermore, but did not speak on then.

Here are my concerns:

1. In many cases over the last few years, a policies have been established based on incorrect and overlooked data. For examples of this, consider the administration's denial of global warming, starting a war in Iraq based on a threat of weapons that in fact did not exist. There are many other examples, although I don't have any from the Department of Energy. My concern is that the Environmental Impact statement and the plan for new projects at the Livermore lab are based on a political agenda

1/30.01 and not on scientific facts. The risk assessments do not take into account the risk of terrorist attacks. But the lab would be an obvious target if new nuclear weapons were being developed there.

2/22.02 2. Over the last 60 years, we still don't know what to do with nuclear waste. We must not produce more of it until we know what to do with it. Neither storing the waste in Livermore nor transporting it out of Livermore is an acceptable option.

3/07.01 3. It is truly an asset to our community to have leading scientists doing work here. We need projects worthy of their attention. One such project would be to develop a better plan for dealing with nuclear waste than to bury it and hope for 10,000 years of good luck. Another issue of utmost importance is to develop safe, sustainable energy sources.

Here are my questions:

4/25.06 1. Which prominent scientists on the LLNL staff approved the risk assessments? Did any senior staff dissent from the assessments?

Kendrick, Daniel
Page 2 of 2

5/31.01 2. Did senior technical staff at LLNL make alternative proposals for the lab's work over the next few years? What were those proposals and what happened to them?

6/04.01 I believe the DOE plan to introduce new weapons programs into LLNL will promote a new arms race and escalate the nuclear danger. Further, the DOE proposal to double LLNL's plutonium storage limit to 3,300 pounds and triple the amount held "at risk" in any one room increases the environmental threat LLNL poses to the people of California. The SWEIS propels Livermore Lab in exactly the wrong direction.

7/07.01 Instead of proposing new weapons projects, DOE should enhance the peaceful, civilian scientific capabilities and mission at Livermore Lab by proposing new, unclassified programs in environmental cleanup, non-polluting and renewable energy, earth sciences, astrophysics, atmospheric physics and others. The alternative of a "green lab" in Livermore should be pursued instead of the dangerous nuclear weapons future proposed by the Site Wide Environmental Impact Statement.

Sincerely,

Daniel Kendrick

Kent, Stephen
Page 1 of 3

Stephen Kent
Box 431
Garrison, NY 10524

May 27, 2004

Mr. Tom Grim
DOE, NNSA L-293
7000 East Ave.
Livermore, CA 94550

Dear Mr. Grim:

1/04.01 I oppose the draft Site Wide Environmental Impact Statement (SWEIS) that proposes to vastly expand nuclear weapons activities at the Livermore National Labs. I reject it on the grounds the new functions it envisions are destabilizing, are illegal under duly ratified treaties, and put public health and the environment at risk.

Don't think the public doesn't understand or doesn't care about the implications of the precipitous swerve of the Bush administration towards an aggressive and illegal nuclear posture. The community of nations and Americans living downwind of the nuclear complex are capable of recognizing it for what it is, and seeing their interest in opposing and denouncing it. As one of them, I oppose SWEIS and denounce the mentality within DOE that produced it.

When will the US government cease seeking false security from ever greater reliance on nuclear weapons, at the cost of ever greater repression of the rights, values and wishes of citizens at home and stimulation of hatred for the US and WMD proliferation abroad? I have no illusions DOE will change course no matter what the public says; recent history is clear on the matter of how administrations ignore public opinion on nuclear issues. But they do so at their peril, and cannot long retain public support by ignoring deeply felt public opinion. Implementing the SWEIS proposal can only deepen public disaffection and exacerbate DOE's credibility gap.

Specifically:

2/01.01 The so-called "Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator," so-called "mini-nukes" and other new nuclear weapons concepts being researched at Livermore Lab are a violation of US treaty commitments including the Nuclear

Kent, Stephen
Page 2 of 3

2/01.01 cont. Non-Proliferation Treaty, signed and ratified by the US and the law of the land.

3/30.01 As recently highlighted by congressional hearings, the labs can't even safeguard their existing nuclear materials from terrorist attacks, let alone doubling and trippling the quantities stored there.

4/27.01 The Plutonium Atomic Vapor Laser Isotope Separation (AVLIS) planned for LLNL will revive a project that was canceled more than 10 years ago because it was dangerous and unnecessary. The US stated categorically to the 1995 NPT review conference it would not embark on such a project. Doing so will further undermine US credibility with nuclear weapons states and non-weapons states alike, already at a dangerous low.

5/26.01, 26.03 Dangerous New Experiments in the National Ignition Facility Mega-Laser will add plutonium, highly-enriched uranium and lithium hydride to experiments in the National Ignition Facility (NIF) mega-laser when it is completed at Livermore Lab. Using these materials in the NIF will increase its usefulness for developing new generation nuclear weapons designs, an abrogation of NPT treaty commitments. It is part of an enabling technology structure for offense nuclear powered lasers including destabilizing space weapons envisioned in US strategic documents. It will also make the NIF more hazardous to workers and the environment.

6/37.01 SWEIS proposes to make Livermore Lab the place to test new manufacturing technologies for producing plutonium pits for nuclear weapons. DOE says these new technologies will then be used in a new bomb core factory, called the Modern Pit Facility (MPF). The Livermore Lab plutonium pit program will enable the MPF and production of 150 - 450 plutonium bomb cores annually, with the ability to run double shifts and produce 900 per year. This production capability would approximate the combined nuclear arsenals of France and China - each year, signalling our intentions despite the NPT and the recent Moscow Treaty to retain and even build on our huge Cold War era arsenals and rely on nuclear hegemony -- a strategy which betrays utter failure to draw the lessons of history.

7/39.01 SWEIS calls for Livermore Lab to develop diagnostics to "enhance" the nation's readiness to conduct full-scale underground nuclear tests at the Nevada Test Site. This is a dangerous step back to the days of unrestrained nuclear testing which will destabilize the world and cause environmental and public health damage.

8/35.01 Plans for collocating an advanced weaponized bio-warfare agent research facility with nuclear weapons activities in a classified area at Livermore Lab entail genetic modification and aerosolization (spraying) with live anthrax, plague and other deadly pathogens on site at LLNL. This could

Kent, Stephen
Page 3 of 3

8/35.01 cont. weaken the international biological weapons treaty -- and it poses a risk to workers, the public and the environment.

1/04.01 cont. The DOE plan to introduce new weapons programs into LLNL will promote a new arms race and escalate nuclear danger Americans face while putting the public and the environment at needless risk at a time when the threat environment is already accute. Don't pretend a limited public comment period legitimizes it, as if it is being done in the name of or for the benefit of citizens, or with their tacit consent . If it happens, it will have been forced down our throats, like much else this DOE and this administration has already done.

Sincerely,

Stephen Kent