

---

---

Please place  
39 cent stamp  
here

(address required for comment to be valid)

Please mail this comment card to us so that we can keep a record of all comments. We will forward your comments to the Department of Energy.

***Stop the DOE's Future Bombplex!  
No New Nuclear Weapons!  
Clean Up, Don't Build Up!***



**Nuclear Watch New Mexico  
551 W. Cordova Rd. #808  
Santa Fe, NM 87505-4100**

*\*\*Comments due January 17, 2007. Please mail to us well beforehand.\*\**

---

---

Please place  
39 cent stamp  
here

(address required for comment to be valid)

Please mail this comment card to us so that we can keep a record of all comments. We will forward your comments to the Department of Energy.

***Stop the DOE's Future Bombplex!  
No New Nuclear Weapons!  
Clean Up, Don't Build Up!***



**Nuclear Watch New Mexico  
551 W. Cordova Rd. #808  
Santa Fe, NM 87505-4100**

*\*\*Comments due January 17, 2007. Please mail to us well beforehand.\*\**

## COMMENTS ON THE SCOPE OF REVIEW OF THE FUTURE BOMBPLEX

Mr. Theodore A. Wyka, Department of Energy, Complex 2030 Document Manager:

The following issues must be included in the scope of public review of the Complex 2030 Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (“Complex 2030 SEIS”):

- Among the given alternatives, DOE only offers false choices between varying degrees of increased nuclear weapons production. An **Enhanced Global Security Alternative** must be also considered, whose essence is responsible custodianship of nuclear weapons while they await dismantling under the framework of the 1970 NonProliferation Treaty.
  - Recently released studies state that plutonium pits, the cores of nuclear weapons, have lifetimes of ~100 years or more. The oldest weapons in the planned stockpile are 28 years old, and therefore have ~70 years or more of remaining life. **What then is the true need for new-design nuclear weapons and production?**
  - Please analyze the impacts of diverting at least 150 billion in taxpayer dollars to new nuclear weapons instead of cleaning up the **massive environmental damage caused by past research and production**. What are the **long-term public health and ecological effects** of leaving radioactive and chemical contaminants that may pollute precious water resources while new, unnecessary, and costly nuclear weapons are being built?
  - Rigorous cost analyses should verify or not DOE’s claim that Complex 2030 will save taxpayer \$\$.
  - As per a recent federal court decision, the adverse consequences of **potential terrorist acts** at DOE nuclear weapons facilities must be analyzed.
  - Because of its likely size and complexity, the public comment period for the draft Complex 2030 SEIS should far exceed the minimum requirement of 45 days. I request 120 days. Upon release of the draft DOE should make all cited reference documents immediately available on the Internet.

Signed,  
(address on reverse)

## COMMENTS ON THE SCOPE OF REVIEW OF THE FUTURE BOMBPLEX

Mr. Theodore A. Wyka, Department of Energy, Complex 2030 Document Manager:

The following issues must be included in the scope of public review of the Complex 2030 Supplemental Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (“Complex 2030 SEIS”):

- Among the given alternatives, DOE only offers false choices between varying degrees of increased nuclear weapons production. An **Enhanced Global Security Alternative** must be also considered, whose essence is responsible custodianship of nuclear weapons while they await dismantling under the framework of the 1970 NonProliferation Treaty.
  - Recently released studies state that plutonium pits, the cores of nuclear weapons, have lifetimes of ~100 years or more. The oldest weapons in the planned stockpile are 28 years old, and therefore have ~70 years or more of remaining life. **What then is the true need for new-design nuclear weapons and production?**
  - Please analyze the impacts of diverting at least 150 billion in taxpayer dollars to new nuclear weapons instead of cleaning up the **massive environmental damage caused by past research and production**. What are the **long-term public health and ecological effects** of leaving radioactive and chemical contaminants that may pollute precious water resources while new, unnecessary, and costly nuclear weapons are being built?
  - Rigorous cost analyses should verify or not DOE’s claim that Complex 2030 will save taxpayer \$\$.
  - As per a recent federal court decision, the adverse consequences of **potential terrorist acts** at DOE nuclear weapons facilities must be analyzed.
  - Because of its likely size and complexity, the public comment period for the draft Complex 2030 SEIS should far exceed the minimum requirement of 45 days. I request 120 days. Upon release of the draft DOE should make all cited reference documents immediately available on the Internet.

Signed,  
(address on reverse)