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MR. SALAZAR: Could I have your attention real briefly. It looks like it is 6:30, but I notice that there are several people still kind of getting through, getting into the building. So we will start here fairly shortly.

I do want to let you know that we have KKFI, 90.1 F.M. radio here that will be recording and taping the meeting. In addition we are also having an official transcript written to capture all public comments.

Please, if you have not done so, we have handouts out there in the hallway for everyone. Some information. Welcome. Glad to see there is such a great turnout of people from the public and we will get started here fairly shortly. Thank you.

(Off the record.)

MR. SALAZAR: Hello, everyone. I want to let you know we are going to start in five minutes. We do have restrooms and water fountains if you need them, right out here in the main lobby here. Just go out to the right.

If you have not done so and you wish to speak, make public comments later on in the meeting, please do so at the registration desk
right outside. And then of course if you have
comments that you want to turn in for written
comments, we have Bill Boos here who is our
official document manager. You can turn in any
written comments there. Thank you.

(Off the record.)

MR. SALAZAR: Hello, everyone. I am so
glad to see we have great participation in today's
meeting. On behalf of the National Nuclear
Security Administration, the U.S. General Services
Administration welcomes you to this Public Scoping
Meeting. It is concerning the potential
environmental impacts associated with the
transformation of facilities and infrastructure
for the non-nuclear production activities
conducted at the NNSA's Kansas City Plant.

The purpose of this meeting is to invite
public participation and to request public
comments on the scope of the environmental
assessment. It is in accordance with the National
Environmental Policy Act, which includes the
potential environmental impacts associated with
the procurement, construction and operation of a
new facility to house NNSA's non-nuclear
component, procurement and manufacturing
operations.

We will not be providing answers to questions during this meeting, but we will be using your comments that you provide today to complete the environmental assessment. So we do encourage you to, if you wish, to make comments, both in a public forum, we have the sign-up sheet outside, or to provide written comments to Bill Boos, our document manager right here. And if you brought something that you are prepared to read, please feel free to. After you are done speaking, if you wish, you can turn that in for the public record.

Now, in addition to oral and written comments received today, GSA will also consider all written comments postmarked by May 30th, 2007. And you can please send those comments to me, Carlos Salazar, at the following address.

SPEAKER: I have a question. What we are asking for is that the comment period not end on May 30th. We want --

MR. SALAZAR: We will have an opportunity after we do our opening remarks and presentations for public comments. So if you have a comment such as that, you can make them at that
time. You will also see my e-mail address up there. It is on the handouts that we have outside as well. I am the GSA presiding official over this meeting today.

Now, the National Environmental Policy Act, also known as NEPA, is a process intended to help public officials make decisions that are based on understanding of environmental consequences and take actions that protect, restore, and enhance the environment.

Now, an environmental assessment is required for a proposed federal action to provide sufficient evidence and analysis for determining whether to prepare an environmental impact statement or to issue a finding of no significant impact. In our next slide here I will actually show our proposed schedule. As you can see from this schedule, GSA is really at the initial start of this process. GSA issued a notice of intent on May 1st and will conclude the first public comment period on May 30th.

Now, we will have a draft of the assessment. We expect to have a draft published in August. I know as some people have asked to extend the comment period, I do want to make you
aware that after we publish this draft and environmental assessment we will have a second comment period for people to send in comments that will last for 30 days. A final environmental assessment then would be published after that, which we are currently projecting around September.

Now, a proposed new facility for the Kansas City plant would be located approximately eight miles south of the existing plant on an undeveloped site at the northwest corner of Missouri Highway 150 and Botts Road. That is in Kansas City, Missouri in District Number 5. GSA would lease the facilities to NNSA, which would relocate its non-nuclear operations from the existing Kansas City plant here in the Bannister Federal Complex. And the relocation would involve moving about two-thirds of the existing capital and process equipment to the new facility. Now, disposition activities of the existing NNSA facilities at the Kansas City plant are not part of the current proposed action and will be addressed in appropriate future environmental analysis. The Kansas City plant is co-located with the Bannister Federal Complex, with GSA, and
disposition activities will require coordination
between both GSA and NNSA.

Now, the proposed facilities will cover
more than 1 million square feet and provide more
than 2,000 surface parking spaces. The current
facilities here at Bannister Complex are
approximately 3 million square feet.

Now, the proposed facilities will meet
current and future production requirements for
NNSA in a modern, cost effective and flexible
manner through reductions in the current
facility while significantly reducing operational,
maintenance, security and energy costs. Now, the
assessment will also evaluate the potential
environmental impacts associated with the
alternatives to the proposed action. And that
includes no action. In essence, continuing NNSA's
non-nuclear operations in the existing Bannister
Federal Complex facilities.

Another alternative is renovate the
existing GSA office here and warehouse space at
the Bannister Federal Complex and then relocating
NNSA's non-nuclear operations to the renovated
facilities here and conduct the future operations
in this facility.
Another alternative is renovating existing GSA office space up in front, and actually demolishing existing GSA warehouse space and constructing and operating a new manufacturing facility on the GSA portion of the Bannister Federal Complex. Another alternative is just demolishing existing GSA office and warehouse space. So demolishing the entire GSA site here and constructing and operating a new office and manufacturing facility on GSA's portion of the Bannister Federal Complex.

So concurrent with the preparation of the environmental assessment, GSA and NNSA will determine the applicability of floodplain management and wetland protection requirements and will publish a notice of proposed floodplain or wetland action as appropriate.

Now, NNSA intends to adopt this environmental assessment for use as a basis of decisions regarding the further transformation and downsizing of non-nuclear production activities performed at the Kansas City plant. This assessment is being prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and regulations implementing the above by the Council
on Environmental Quality, also known as the CEQ.

NNSA's non-nuclear operations include
the procurement and manufacture of electrical,
electronic, electromechanical, plastic, and
mechanical components for the nuclear weapons
program. Hazardous wastes are generated through
the general industrial processes and include
acidic and alkaline liquids, solvents, oils and
coolants. Now, the Kansas City plant is a
non-nuclear site and does not have special nuclear
materials. But operations do generate a small
level -- or small quantities of low level
radioactive waste consistent with general industry
practices.

GSA and NNSA believe that the relocation
of the non-nuclear production mission to another
location outside of Kansas City is not a
reasonable alternative and we do not intend to
analyze it as an alternative in the environmental
assessment. Please, if you wish, you are welcome
to make public comments on that as well.

DOE completed -- let me give you a
little bit of a history here. DOE completed a
nuclear weapons complex reconfiguration, Complex
21 study in January of 1991, which identified
significant cost savings that could be achieved by downsizing the nuclear weapons complex. On January 27th, 1992, the Department of Energy issued a notice of intent to prepare an environmental assessment for the consolidation of non-nuclear production activities within the nuclear weapons complex. On September 14th, 1993, the Department of Energy published a finding of no significant impact regarding its proposal to eliminate -- proposal to terminate non-nuclear production missions at the Pantax Plant in Ohio, the Pinellas Plant in Florida, the Rocky Flats Plant in Colorado, and consolidate the electrical and mechanical manufacturing functions here at the Kansas City plant.

The Department of Energy issued a notice of intent on June 6, 1995; final Stockpile Stewardship and Management, Programmatic, Environmental Impact statements on November 19th, 1996; and a record of decision on December 26th, 1996, announcing its decision to transform the weapons production complex by further downsizing the nuclear weapons complex. This decision included reducing non-nuclear component fabrication capacity here at the Kansas City
plant. In these documents the Department of Energy evaluated alternatives for the consolidation of non-nuclear manufacturing, storage, surveillance functions of the nuclear weapons complex to the Kansas City plant and reducing the capacity for non-nuclear component fabrication. The proposed action will continue the consolidation and downsizing of non-nuclear activities at the Kansas City plant which was begun in the early 1990's.

Now, the alternatives are constructed around the mission need to maintain the Kansas City plant while downsizing for life cycle efficiencies. Keeping these activities in the Kansas City area is consistent with NNSA's broader proposed transformation of the U.S. nuclear weapons complex and is based on previous NEPA analysis and decisions described above and on economic analysis.

GSA and NNSA invite everyone to make comments on this issue. The evaluation of alternatives will be based on the construction's impact on the effected environment. So this would include location, land use, demographics, socioeconomic environment, historical and cultural
resources and infrastructure.

In addition, the alternative will evaluate environmental consequences such as flora and fauna, wetlands, air quality, noise, waste generation and cumulative environmental impacts. So possible NEPA conclusions include a finding of no significant impact, which is also known as a FNSI, or the completion of an environmental impact statement.

Before we begin accepting public comments, please let me introduce some of our representatives that we have at the head table. We have Curtis Roth, who is the NNSA NEPA compliance officer. We have Elizabeth Noakes, who is with PSI. She is one of GSA's lead contractors helping us out with the environmental assessment. We have Mark Holecek, who is NNSA's deputy site manager, and Brad Scott, who is GSA's Regional Administrator.

Now, I have invited Mark Holecek and Brad Scott here to provide an overview of the Kansas City Plant Project and discuss GSA's role in the real estate transactions. So with that, we are very pleased to have Mark kick off this action.
MR. HOLECEK: Thank you, Carlos. NNSA and GSA have entered into a partnership to move forward with this project. And I wanted to take this opportunity to thank GSA for all they have done to help us and move us forward.

Okay. This map shows the NNSA's complex around the country. And the reason I show this, we are here in the Kansas City Plant. This plant has no special nuclear materials. We support the weapons complex through our activities, but we have no nuclear materials here. The rest of the complex includes the Y-12 plant, the Savannah River Plant and the Pantex Plant, those are sister plants. It also includes designing systems, which are the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, the Los Alamos National Laboratory and Sandia National Laboratory. Most people know about the test site which is a maintenance facility.

This is a picture of the Bannister Federal Complex. Right now you are sitting right about here. The building is a very large building, the main building. It spans this area here. This half of the facility is GSA space. And NNSA controls this space over here. The building directly to the east of us is what used
to be the IRS service facility, which recently has
transformed their operations and moved into town.

Some important points to note about this
facility. The facility was built in 1942 to
support the war effort. It was built to
manufacture aircraft engines. It is a very large
facility. At the time it was built this was
primarily farmland out here. There was no
residential or other areas around here. Today you
find residential areas pretty much spanning the
entire area, even up here on the hill above us.

The other thing that I would like to
point out about this map is to the south of the
facility and along the east side we have a flood
protection system. The reason for that is that
this facility, the entire facility is in the
100-Year Floodplain. So when the river comes up
this protection system is intended to keep the
waters out.

Now, when we started working on this
project we evaluated various different options and
came up with a set of options that we felt were
reasonable to proceed with. One of those --
several of those options Carlos mentioned earlier.
They primarily look at this portion of the
facility. The reason for that is that we don't have enough vacant space to just build a new facility on vacant space on the complex. The options that we are looking at on the GSA side include renovation of this space, tearing down the manufacturing space and renovating the office space or just creating an entirely new facility in that space.

The Kansas City plant, like I said, we are co-located in this facility. Have been for 60 years. We do national defense-related manufacturing and engineering services. We are very proud to do that. We primarily produce electrical and mechanical assemblies. No nuclear materials are done here. Our tag line is we like to think of ourselves as being the nation's provider for advanced technologies and secure environment.

As mentioned before, we have mechanical, electronic and engineering material factories. And we are unique in that aspect in the country that we have all of those activities under one roof and the capabilities and capacities that we have. We also have support functions, we have the analytical and test labs and high performance
computing within the building.

Our mission stands on 40 product technologies with 90 advanced technologies. 3,000 active part numbers and 60,000 product packages that we ship annually from this facility. Our tag line is we can build anything from semi-conductors to semi-trailers.

We have labeled the project KCRIMS, which is Kansas City Responsive Infrastructure Manufacturing Sourcing Facility. The goals of this project are to create a responsive manufacturing facility that will continue our mission into the future. We want to be able to meet emerging threats and changing missions. Our mission changes rapidly and we need to be able to be flexible within the facility to meet those mission changes.

And also we want to reduce costs both for long-term costs and near-term costs. We are looking for immediate cost savings at this facility. And we are looking for large reductions in the cost of operations in our new facility. Essentially what we would like to do is go from our current approach, which is highly capital intensive, a high fixed cost, to a lower or
variable cost environmental facility.

On March 30th we concluding a process that NNSA goes through for all facility acquisitions. It is called our critical decision process. Essentially in that process we looked at all the aspects of the project, where we wanted to go with it, et cetera, and come up with our proposed option, which is then subjected to the NEPA analysis process which we are kicking off here today.

The proposed option consists of three parts. The first part is to pursue new construction using the GSA leasing process and to prepare for the relocation and occupancy, essentially the plan and make the move. The last piece, which we will cover separately, is the plan for redeployment of the Bannister Federal Complex. The site we are sitting in today. The facility benefits.

We feel there are a large number of benefits we will gain from making this transition. We want to size the facility for our workload for our mission. In our current facility we have a lot of unutilized space, a lot of underutilized-equipment. We would like to move to
a facility where we are sized for the current mission. At one time in this factory we had about 9,000 people working under one roof. Today we have about 2,500. So that gives you a sense of the scope of the change of our mission over time.

We want this facility to be designed for our mission. The factory we are in today was designed to manufacture aircraft components. We are not in the aircraft manufacturing business, so it doesn't meet our needs from a layout perspective.

As we move the new facility, we would also like to eliminate many of the environmental safety and health hazards that we have. We have undergone a process over probably the last 20 years where we have eliminated most of those. Our goal in the new facility is that we have none. And obviously we would like to reduce costs as we move forward.

Another benefit from the project is we will have more flexible and responsive space in the new facility. The facility we have today, we have a lot of what we call monuments. We have roof penetrations, floor penetrations, large pieces of equipment can't be moved very easily
within the facility. But as our mission changes we want to be able to easily reconfigure and not have to do a construction project essentially to change our layouts. We are implementing a concept that we call white space. Essentially what that is is open space within the new facility where when we want to reconfigure, we have a space to move to and we continuously keep some space for that approach.

When you lay out a new facility, you get a lot of opportunities that you don't have in a legacy facility. You get to lay it out for your manufacturing mission. That's what we talked about work flow and infinities. We would like for our products to be able to flow ostensibly through the operation and to make it a more efficient layout, and by moving to a blank sheet of paper, it offers us the ability to do that.

In the new facility we are going to implement modern facility concepts. Industry has gone to this utility grid arrangement which essentially is hanging your utilities off of every other column. That allows you shorter utility runs, shorter electrical line runs, et cetera, to your equipment and that saves you a lot of cost as
you move forward.

Another legacy activity within the current facility is we have ceiling heights that range anywhere from 10 to 40 feet. That is not very conducive to moving and rearranging equipment. We would like to have an increased clear height and a common clear height in our new facility. That will allow us to more easily move equipment around as we move into the facility.

The other aspect is a lot of our equipment is very heavy or vibration sensitive and so we have special flooring in place for that equipment. We would like to have a common floor throughout the facility. That would allow us again to be more flexible in our rearrangement types of activities.

As we move forward, we are moving into a new facility and we would like to be as energy efficient as possible. And so the plan is to have the facility go for what is called the LEED Silver Status, which means that we are designing and constructing the facility in such a way that allows us to be as environmentally friendly as we can.

Okay, at this point I will turn it over.
to Brad, who will talk about the GSA portion of
the project.

MR. SCOTT: Thank you, Mark. Welcome to
GSA, everyone. My name is Brad Scott. I am the
regional administrator for the General Services
Administration here in the Heartland region. I
oversee a region, four states, Missouri, Kansas,
Iowa and Nebraska.

GSA helps federal agencies better serve
the public by offering at best value superior
workplaces, expert solutions, acquisition services
and management policies. We have essentially
three business lines. We acquire goods, we
acquire services and we acquire or construct or
manage facilities. It is in the latter that we
were engaged.

GSA's Public Building Service designs
and builds award-winning federal buildings, leases
real estate on behalf of government agencies,
repairs, alters and renovates facilities, donates
or sells real estate for federal agencies, and is
a leader in energy conservation, sustainability,
recycling and historic preservation. The Public
Building Service oversees nationally some 378
million square feet. In my region alone I oversee
some 22 million square feet.

The GSA's PBS was engaged to assist NNSA in exploring options for the construction of or renovation of a new facility. GSA as a part of its due diligence identified land at the northwest corner of 150 Highway and Botts Road in Kansas City, Missouri as the proposed alternative site for the Kansas City plant. This proposed site is subject to and would not become final until completion of an environmental analysis conforming to the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and other applicable local, state and federal environmental laws and regulations.

The proposed alternative site was selected from some two dozen sites in a 25-mile radius which bisected Missouri and Kansas state line. It is supported by infrastructure that when upgraded will support the new plant. That infrastructure includes roads, rail, sewer, water, as well as the electrical grid. It is notable that whether you go north, south, east or west on this site, that the entire area is planned for industrial use.

GSA will conduct a full and open competition for the Competition In Contracting Act
to select a developer to build a new facility. The selected developer will construct a building to NNSA specifications while overseen by GSA. Selection of the winning proposal will be based on greatest value to the government. GSA enters into the lease contract on behalf of the government, oversees construction to assure compliance with the specifications, and it administers the lease over the lease term.

This is essentially a traditional build-to-suit lease. The selection of the developer lease award will be under a two-step selection process. Step 1, short listing process based on the credentials and portfolio of work to be offered. Step 2, selection of the best proposal. Final evaluation will be based upon technical ability and price, which includes conceptual design and rental rate.

Finally, I would note that as a part of GSA's mission and responsibility, a redeployment of this facility will be of paramount importance to us. As was mentioned, GSA owns some 2 million square feet on the west end of the complex and NNSA owns some 3.2 million square feet. From the inception of our relationship and engagement with
NNSA, we were committed to working together for the redeployment as a whole where that made the most sense. What will likely happen once NNSA is able to move into the new facility and the current complex is cleaned to city, county, state and federal specifications, they will then convey the property to GSA for redeployment.

GSA has a five-step process that we follow to put excess federal property back in to good use, productive use for the community. We have engaged city officials, city elected officials, as well as county, state and federal officials and have briefed many of them on our plans for the future.

Again, the redeployment of this complex, which would include its cleanup, is of paramount importance to us. And we will be partnering with the city, the county, and the state as represented by the Department of Natural Resources as we move forward. Again, welcome to GSA.

MR. SALAZAR: Thank you very much, Mark and Brad. They provided some insight into the project. So we thank you.

Now, we are about to start our public comment period. Before we do so, let me again
point out that we have restrooms and water fountains outside in the lobby, if you exit to your right. And if you have not done so and you wish to provide public comments, please register at the table outside. There is a sign-up sheet located directly outside this auditorium. And at this time we will go ahead and begin taking public comments.

Again, let me remind you that we will not be providing answers to your comments. What we will be doing is recording all your comments and incorporating them into our environmental analysis, which we will make publicly available, and again take comments after we publish that from the public.

Now, as I call your name, please approach the center podium and offer your comments. I ask that you keep your comments to no more than three minutes. Speak slowly so we can have our reporter capture all your comments for the record. And if you would, please state your name and/or represented organization in case I can't quite make it out here. And then if you have a written statement that you are reading from and you wish to enter it into the record, you can
hand that over to Bill Boos sitting right beside me here. The first person here is Jay --

SPEAKER: Coghlan.

MR. SALAZAR: There we go.

MR. COGHLAN: Thanks GSA and NNSA. Can everybody hear me okay?

MR. SALAZAR: If you would repeat your name and the representing organization.

MR. COGHLAN: Jay Coghlan.

C-o-g-h-l-a-n. I work for a non-profit by the name of Nuclear Watch in New Mexico. I am from Santa Fe, New Mexico. I have been a watch dog in Los Alamos for about 18 years now, now taking an interest in the Kansas City plant. Lucky for you all. I am also pretty accustomed to these NEPA hearings.

And the first thing that I would point out to the crowd, it is somewhat obvious, but needs noting. You hear all of these technical details. Everything sounds nice. Of course what is really going on is a national and international debate over the future of nuclear weapons. And one of the many reasons I am interested in the Kansas City plant, you know, first of all, I want to give credit where credit is due. I am struck
that the plant actually seems well run. Which is
refreshing after Los Alamos for example. So I
give you credit there. On the other hand, you
guys and gals are front and center in the nuclear
weapons complex cranking out 85 percent of all
components that go into the U.S. stockpile.

Now, I already notice this trend that
you are very fond of stressing the fact that these
components are non-nuclear. Indeed they are.
Nevertheless, let's also observe the obvious, they
go into nuclear weapons. And without those
components, those weapons are not going to work.
And those weapons are weapons of mass destruction.
And furthermore, you are getting ready to crank up
big time for new designs under so-called Reliable
Replacement Warheads. And I noticed with great
interest one of your handouts that contains the
phrase that this new plant is meant to have the
flexibility to enable rapid configuration to meet
changing production requirements. Well, I am well
versed enough to know that that is code for the
Reliable Replacement Warhead.

Now, so here is this debate going. And
you know, you can probably deduce in advance that
I am not exactly a fan of Henry Kissinger, but yet
it is remarkable that we now have very high-level ex-officials calling for a world free of nuclear weapons. That's what we have to do. And we can't go talking to other countries to tell them to get rid of theirs while the other sites, and the brand new environmentally certified Kansas City plant starts cranking out new weapons. So enough on that wrap. Of course I am going to run out of time. You just call it when the time comes, because I can go on ad nauseum. But to get down to NEPA.

I have litigated three times under NEPA and I have won three times. One was against a facility that blows up mock surrogate plutonium pits at Los Alamos. They wanted to build it without an environmental impact statement. It seems wrong from the get-go. Other litigation was against a biolab handling pathogens like Anthrax and plague at Los Alamos. And another NEPA litigation was for the Departments of Energy's failing to ever come up with a national clean-up plan. Now, my point there, I suppose I have two.

MR. SALAZAR: Your three minutes are up, sir. So if you could wrap it up in a few seconds. If we have to -- we have a lot of people here, so
I want to make sure that everyone gets the chance
to speak. If we have time at the end, I will
invite you to come back up. It's clear you have a
lot to say.

MR. COGHLAN: It is very good of you. I
will go ahead and take another minute to finish
up. So what I was doing was presenting my NEPA
bona fides, whatever you want to call the
credentials. The point I am reaching for is, boy,
do I smell a ripe NEPA case here.

Mr. Salazar gave a very brief
dissertation of NEPA history. I could add much to
it. In the 1996 Stockpile Stewardship and
Management, Programmatic, Environmental Impact
statement, one of the formal alternatives for
non-nuclear fabrication was to relocate those
functions to the weapons labs. I think what you
all are doing is illegal under NEPA. You have
pre-emptively set the stage and the scope to have
the plant here in the Kansas City plant. I think
that is wrong. And at a minimum, you better come
out with an environmental impact statement rather
than just a lower level environmental assessment.

So in any event, I look forward to
continuing this dialogue with you all. I will
bore you with very extensive written comments that hopefully will compel you to come up with many cogent answers. So thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: I believe our next speaker we have is Corva Murphy from PeaceWorks. And Corva, we have a timer here that we will start to help people that I haven't pointed out already to give you an idea when your three minutes are up.

MS. MURPHY: Okay. Well, my name is Corva Murphy and I am a member of PeaceWorks. PeaceWorks is a grass roots peace and anti-nuclear organization. We have been in existence for 25 years.

In order to save time, because all the people speaking from PeaceWorks are going to relate to this one problem as we see it, and then I will state the problem and when they come up they can just say that I am referring to the problem.

Here is the problem. The Kansas City plant's ten-year plan states that the plant is aggressively evaluating transformation options that could be completed on a timeline to support qualification of the Reliable Replacement Warhead or RRW program.
The RRW is a new generation of nuclear weapons that will replace the cold war nuclear weapons stockpile. So here is my comment. Please let us not forget our moral and ethical compass. Further nuclear armament is amoral and unethical. It is fallacious reasoning to assert that the world will be safer by building a new generation of nuclear weapons.

Just look at the situation we are in today and ask yourself, how did nuclear weapons play a role. Saddam Hussein was so afraid that Iran would find out that Iraq did not have a nuclear weapons program that he played the most dangerous game of pretending that he did have nuclear capability. And Iran is so afraid of Israel's nuclear weapons that they are actively ramping up their own nuclear weapons program. And we know what our president wants to do to Iran. And the list goes on and on. I ask you, how does this make us safer?

MR. SALAZAR: Thank you very much. And we have our next speaker, Patricia Nelson with PeaceWorks.

MS. NELSON: My name is Patricia Nelson, and I am the Vice Chairperson of PeaceWorks Kansas.
City. As Corva told you, we have been in
existence for 25 years. And we are an
anti-nuclear organization and our affiliation is
with Peace Action out of Washington, D.C.

There has been no public hearing or
forum in Kansas City to debate whether a nuclear
weapons plant should even be built here. It
appears that the nuclear weapons industry is
expecting the American people to sit idly by
without a free and Democratic debate about this.
We are here to do that.

The new, supposedly usable nuclear
warheads that you are proposing to build are
simply an effort to perpetuate the military
industrial conflict. Which exists only for its
own profit, not for the good of the people. The
excuse of mutually assured destruction as a
deterrent is simply not valid at this time when
dirty bombs can be transferred in a suitcase.

The fallout from these weapons would
kill thousands of innocent people including, I
dare say, some U.S. citizens as well. There are
no victors, only victims in a nuclear war. As
other countries see us building new nuclear
weapons, it will only force them to do the same,
thus restarting the cold war. We should get on
with building a sustainable future for the world's
people and stop this us versus them mentality
before it destroys us all. Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: Next I see two people.

Jane Stoever and Henry Stoever.

MS. STOEVER: Hi there. I am Jane
Stoever, I am a public citizen. My husband and I
have raised two children in the Kansas City area.
We have lived in the Kansas City area for about 30
years. I am basically speaking as a public
citizen.

The 10-year plan of the Kansas City
plant calls for the new plant to support the
Reliable Replacement Warhead program, the next
generation of nuclear weaponry. Such weapons
could not exist without the Kansas City nuclear
plant. The commitment to expand it instead of
squash nuclear weapons, however, is the first
reason the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists this
January moved its Dooms Day Clock from seven
minutes to midnight to five minutes to midnight.
Something that I imagine you all are familiar
with. And I have the statement of their board of
directors attached to my own statement here. They
were signifying the danger that nuclear weapons
and other elements such as climate change pose to
the entire world.

We stand at the brink of a second
nuclear age, wrote the board of directors of the
Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. Not since the
first atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and
Nagasaki has the world faced such perilous
choices. A renewed emphasis on the military
utility of nuclear weapons, the failure to
adequately secure nuclear materials and the
continued presence of some 26,000 nuclear weapons
in the United States and Russia are symptomatic of
a larger failure to solve the problems posed by
the most destructive technology on earth. The
directors' statement goes on to explain that there
have been countries that have completely stopped
their nuclear weapons programs and those include
Argentina, Brazil and South Africa. So we should
not think that it is beyond the pale, that it is
impossible for a country to say we are going to
put an end to it from our perspective.

The directors' statement also documents
nuclear false alarms that have included four times
in '79, '80, '83 and '95. Either the U.S. or
Soviet Russian forces were placed on the highest alert and missile launch crews were given preliminary launch warnings. In other words, accidental launches could happen through programming for the event of an attack all by mistake. It goes without saying that nuclear weapons serve as a magnet to terrorists who may misuse them and commit horrendous devastation with them.

I am asking as a mother and as someone who has lived here in the Kansas City area and wants to promote the health of the human race, can't international diplomacy and the vast quantity of current weapons provide sufficient protection to the human race? And I am sure that you also already know that we have about 10,000 U.S. nuclear warheads. I say enough. We don't need new brands of nuclear fire power. We don't need our daughters and sons working in the plant to enable their use. Thank you.

MR. STOEVER: I am Henry Stoever, a practicing attorney for the last 25 years in state and federal court. My criticism of this process is that there should be prior full disclosure by the government, by the agencies and by the
operators. Since I believe it is 1949 you have been operating a plant here. There should be volumes of records as to how you have treated the air, and the ground, the ground water, what mistakes have been made. In order for the public to fully understand and to fully be able to comment, that information should be disclosed first.

Second is, the wrong course is being suggested. Yes, we have an environment of the cold war and the arms race spiraled out of control. And during that period Honeywell or Bendix was involved, again with supporting weapons production. Then we had 30 years of a constructive, corrective course. We had a comprehensive test ban treaties, a non-proliferation treaties, the antiballistic missile treaties, a strategic arms limitation talks, SALT.

Currently this Bush administration is going backwards and is out of step with the past 30 years. They have refused to extend treaties, they have attempted to renegotiate treaties, and they are creating further tension by this new development in nuclear technology. Many have
rejected the Bush administration because of its harmful and dangerous policies.

I would like to also make a point about first strike or first use of nuclear weapons. We have had a long history of not striking first unless we have been subject to attack. This Bush administration is the first administration in the United States that has proposed this hostile, provocative move and Honeywell is directly involved in this first strike by making their weaponry more efficient.

I am asking you to vote no to reject the operation, the replacement or the further development of nuclear weapons as done at this plant here. I urge you to vote against it. I am going to send copies of my statement to all of the U.S. representatives in this area, Kansas and Missouri. And I would like to have a copy of the comments that were made tonight. Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: Our next speaker is Charles Carney.

MR. CARNEY: Carney. Good evening. My name is Charles Carney. I am a concerned citizen and I live in Kansas City, Kansas. Let's not forget that the Reliable Replacement Warhead is a
new family of new warheads intended to simplify
the design of the current arsenal. The Department
of Energy asserts that this new family of weapons
will not have to be tested. I cannot imagine that
the Pentagon will deploy nuclear weapons that have
never been tested. Let's face reality. The
testing of these new nuclear weapons will release
dangerous, toxic radiation into the environment.
In the name of humanity I object. And I am proud
to go on record and saying not in my name.

MR. SALAZAR: Next speaker is Ron Faust.

MR. FAUST: Ron Faust. F-a-u-s-t. I am
with DPF and AFSC. The implications are far more
deeper than the human costs and moral costs. I
would like to address some of that by means of
sharing with you a poem.

"Final Regrets. Poised to build a
Bombplex, when we might peer over the nuclear
abyss, and ask ourselves if it is worth the
potential for destruction and finality, for
someone at least, maybe even bantably, we would
probably come to the edge later, with regrets.

We the people would ask if we would
learn anything about heeding Eisenhower's warning
that every missile that is made signifies a theft
from the poor. His conclusion that this is not a
healthy way of life, this military industrial
complex, that ultimately drains our soul of joy
and life.

Our future on this planet could easily
be destroyed by irresponsible decisions,
shortsighted by economic interests and moral
bankruptcy, and fear of the phantom enemy, that
today many of us are motivated not by force, but
rather by courage of convictions. That we are
placed here to unite rather than to divide. To
make things better, than to spend a lot of money
to keep Nations fearful.

The buildup of arms used to be called
MAD. Mutual Assured Destruction. Which on the
face of it is an insane idea that could destroy
the whole world. And so that we are asking is a
moral turnaround that could reverse a cold war
mentality, which of course is the easy way out,
and know that the real, genuine work requires
peacemaking, not by force, but by nurturing
communities and communicating through conflicts
and not coming to the nuclear edge with final
regrets." Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: Forgive me if I can't --
it is maybe Diana Constantineau.

MS. CONSTANTINEAU: Donna Constantineau.

My name is Donna Constantineau. I am a board member of PeaceWorks. And our mission is to complete abolition of all nuclear weapons.

First of all, I object to this limited scoping hearing. The draft document that you are preparing is an environmental assessment, which is a low level National Environmental Policy Act document. It provides only a cursory analysis of the Kansas City plant facility operation and its potential impact. The Kansas City plant facility is a key facility in the Department of Energy's nuclear weapons complex. Its non-nuclear components make up the majority of parts that are in U.S. nuclear weapons.

The Kansas City role in U.S. nuclear weapons policy and its potential impact on workers and the environment all point to the need to conduct an environmental impact statement rather than just an environmental assessment. Therefore, we demand that there be a Complex 2030 hearing in Kansas City and the community has a right to be heard.

In regard to the National Nuclear
Security Administration's view that the Kansas City plant has no significant impact, this was read earlier, but I would like to reiterate it. From the Kansas City plant's ten-year plan it states, "The Kansas City plant is aggressively evaluating transformation options that could be completed on a timeline to support qualifications of the Reliable Replacement Warhead program."

The Reliable Replacement Warhead, as we all know, is part of Complex 2030, and its goal is to develop a whole new generation of nuclear weapons. I think one would therefore conclude that the Kansas City plant does have a significant role in the nuclear production activities of the nuclear weapons complex.

And I would like to end by reminding everyone about our U.S. obligation to the Article 6 of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which is that we should be moving toward complete disarmament. And I am going to quote -- Jay referred to Henry Kissinger and others quote from the Wall Street Journal. This was January 4th. George Schultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger and Sam Nunn wrote, "Nuclear weapons to date present tremendous danger and also an historic
opportunity. The U.S. leadership is required to
take the world to the next stage to a solid
consensus, reversing reliance on nuclear weapons
globally as a vital contribution to preventing
proliferation into potentially dangerous hands and
ultimately ending them as a threat to the world."

MR. SALAZAR: Our next speaker is John
Long.

MS. LONG: Make that Jonne.

MR. SALAZAR: I suspected as much when
you started walking up.

MS. LONG: Quite all right. So my name
is Jonne Long and I am also representing the
Disciples Peace Fellowship, as was Ron Faust. Its
purpose since 1935, for over 70 years, is to keep
alive the passion for peace in the United States.
I have lived in the Kansas City area for over 40
years and I have been employed by the local
community college district during most of that
time.

First I would like to say that I have no
ill will toward any of the many fine and capable
people who work for the National Nuclear Security
Administration Kansas City plant, or any of you
who are from GSA and other related things. You
are all very excellent and capable people. You are doing your best toward an excellent mission statement. You have a reputation for excellence in all that you do. I know a few people who have or are working out here.

I am impressed with your mission statement and with all the materials that you have given us. It shows your attention to detail and your care for what you are doing. And I applaud your plans to try to build an environmentally friendly plant and I appreciate all the planning work that has gone into this. As somebody who works in planning myself, I know the hours of toil that goes in to all this kind of planning and I appreciate what you are doing.

My concern, however, is with the production of nuclear weapons. Unfortunately the work that your plant does, while non-nuclear in nature, does support nuclear weapons industry. A nuclear weapon, as has already been pointed out, wouldn't be operable without the 85 percent of its components made here. It is my understanding that the proposed new plant will continue to make components for this new generation of nuclear weapons. Nuclear weapons are, as has also been
pointed out, very hazardous to the environment. Not only just locally but for the United States and for the world.

You have so much capability and flexibility to produce constructive products. You could take this transition as an opportunity to eliminate the production of components for nuclear weapons from your mission, because you have so many other things that you are capable of doing as has been pointed out. So surely the half billion dollars proposed for this plant could better be used for building healthier products such as solar panels, wind mills and low carbon emitting automobiles.

Our children, our grandchildren and all the future generations are depending on us to do the right thing within our limited resources.

Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: The next speaker we have is Dawn Willenborg with PeaceWorks and Shalom House.

MS. WILLENBORG: My name is Dawn Willenborg. I live and work as a volunteer at the Shalom Catholic Worker House in Kansas City, Kansas. We are a homeless shelter for 25 men.
Our Mission is to live in solidarity with the poor and to promote peace, justice and life. This new half billion dollar facility is a waste of money. We have to be blind not to see the poverty, suffering and immense need in our presence. We should be spending our time, money and resources on building a better world, not building weapons. Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: Next we have Mike, maybe Roepke.

MR. ROEPKE: Pretty close. Not bad. Good evening, sir. I am Mike Roepke, Local Lodge 778, IMAW. I represent the entire hourly work force currently at the MADIC facility. We, the Union, currently support the endeavor to upgrade our working facility. Keeping in mind that moving our -- keeping in mind that moving our facility must not hinder our hourly work force with the loss of our expertise, current job assignment, technology transfer or any skills that we currently possess. We support and encourage a unique modernization effort. Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: Next I have Amrita Burdick.

MS. BURDICK: My name is Amrita Burdick.
I am here as a U.S. citizen and a citizen of the world. I find it very difficult to imagine how a facility that creates components that support nuclear warheads can fail to have an environmental impact if not here, certainly elsewhere. And I cannot support that. I also cannot support the hypocrisy of a nation who wishes to continue to increase our nuclear capabilities while threatening others who attempt to develop them.

Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: Next I have here L.D. Harsin.

MR. HARSIN: L.D. Harsin, Independence, Missouri. Local resident. Thank you for the opportunity to make a statement here. Is that better? I am concerned about the possible toxic contamination of another site. So many times after the fact and often when the weapons plant has closed we learn of hazardous materials having been used and dangers that may have existed for employees and area residents and the need for a toxic site cleanup. In a statement the GSA administrator referred to the future cleanup of the existing site and Mr. Salizar explained that the plant produces a low level of radioactive
waste.

In that light, I would like to contain any contamination to the current site and not possibly contaminate another area. And if the new site is approved, with it being a part of the new Warhead Replacement Program, and thus new chemicals and materials may be used, who will look after the interests of the Kansas City residents and notify us of the hazardous chemicals and radioactive materials that may be present? Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: Pat Kenoyer.

MS. KENOYER: I am Pat Kenoyer. I am a native of Kansas City, born like 82 years ago here in the Heart of America. And I speak from my membership in PeaceWorks Kansas City and from 61 years as a sister of Loretto.

My statement. Kansas City must not be part of plans to increase production of nuclear weapons. We must not continue to contribute to the evil system which equates power and international prestige with the possession of these most effective methods of death and lingering contamination. Some United States communities are saying no to the nuclear arsenal
buildup. We join them in saying no to any part of these plans. We must not foster fear and wasteful expense in the name of security. Real security consists in a sustainable environment which protects all our natural resources. I was glad that you think about the flora and the fauna, and I'm sure you think of the human beings also.

One most precious resource is our own self-respect. Respect which comes from being a nation that keeps its treaty promises and deserves the respect of other nations, not the fear and hatred that come from nuclear threats. I repeat, we want no part of these evil plans for weapons of death. We want true security policies that foster trust, not fear, and environment which protects our planet, not destroys it. I pray that 2030 will see this very site clean of contamination and our minds and our hearts clean of fear.

We in Kansas City, and I think you will find this out, in cooperation with other communities will marshal the will and the effective means to change the course that GSA and NNSA are proposing to us. We must leave to our children a different vision of 2030. A world where nuclear weapons are well on the way to
extinction. Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: Next person to speak is Ann Suellentrop.

MS. SUELLENTROP: Good evening. I am Ann Suellentrop, and I am -- I have worked as a maternal child nurse in Kansas City for 30 years, working to guard and promote the public's health and safety. I oppose building new weapons facilities, whether it is nuclear or a non-nuclear facility, because I think we need to protect our health and environment. We need to do things that are life giving, life promoting, not things that will increase the risks to our health and our earth.

Nuclear weapons are obviously an environmental issue. Nuclear waste increases environmental degradation. Mining for uranium would have to be increased for new nuclear weapons.

And I am enclosing with my written statement an article from the Kansas City Star on May 13th, 2007, which cites $2.6 billion paid over five years by the Labor Department's office of Workers' Compensation Program to workers who develop cancer from exposure to radiation at
nuclear facilities. And I would like to read from
this article, if I may.

It starts off, "Walter MacKenzie's
assignment toward the end of the cold war was to
mop up after mishaps at a nuclear weapons factory.
With a crew of other laborers from rural Georgia,
he swabbed away leaks and spills inside the secret
buildings until one day his body became so
contaminated with radiation that alarms at the
factory went off as he passed. 'They couldn't
scrub the radiation off my skin even after four
showers,' MacKenzie, 52, recalled of his most
terrifying day at the Savannah River Nuclear
Weapons Plant near Aiken, South Carolina. 'They
took my clothes, my watch and even my ring and
sent me home in rubber slippers and a jump suit.'
Later when doctors discovered the first of 19
malignant tumors on his bladder, MacKenzie
followed the same path as thousands of nuclear
weapons workers with cancer. He filed a claim for
federal compensation."

We need to convert our military and
nuclear industries into the production of civilian
goods and services. Like Johnny mentioned, solar
panels, windmills, public transportation, new
automobiles that do not emit carbon dioxide from
the atmosphere.

Let's get off this death dealing
economy. Weapons just use up resources and money.
They don't produce anything positive or
productive. Nuclear weapon production is
suicidal. It is not healthy for children or other
living things. Life is precious and we only have
one earth. We should do everything we can to
safeguard it. Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: Next we have Barbara
McCracken.

MS. MCCrackEN: I am Barbara McCracken.
Friends. I am a religious sister, a nun from the
Atchison, Kansas Community of Mount St.
Scholastica. I have lived and worked with the
poor and have been involved in peace and justice
issues in Kansas City, Kansas for over 30 years.
Currently I am assistant administrator of the
Keeler Women's Center, Donnelly College.

I would like to share with you a little
information on the current teaching of the
Catholic church toward the possibility of a new
generation of nuclear weapons. There are those
who believe the Catholic church has lost some of
its credibility to speak on social issues, due to
the sexual abuse scandals. However, the church is
still highly involved in the full spectrum of life
issues, teaching that all people and all of
creation is made in God's image. The church
constantly reminds all people of good will to have
at least enough love and respect for what God has
made, not to kill or destroy it. For those who
accept this, the possibility of using nuclear
weapons is unthinkable. The Holy sea has
numerous -- that is the Vatican. Has numerous
statements regarding nuclear weapons.

As recently as last week the Holy
Father's permanent observer at the U.N. made three
points I would like to share with you, applying
them to this country.

One, To counter terrorism, U.S. needs to
move away from reliance on nuclear weapons as a
central part of our nation's military doctrine.
There is a strong bond between nuclear disarmament
and nuclear non-proliferation.

Two, we need to create a climate of
confidence and cooperation with other nations.
Nothing less than our collective security as a
human family is at stake. The U.S. needs to pay
more attention to treaties, to reduce and
eliminate these weapons of mass destruction. This
would furnish a legal basis for international
verification under the auspices of the
International Atomic Energy Agency. It would also
assist in the elimination of nuclear weapons.

Three, we need to raise awareness in the
international community that the U.S. believes in
peace. By doing analysis and taking practical
steps toward disarmament. That would mean
abandoning the ill-conceived plans behind
Complex 2030, the Reliable Replacement Warhead,
and other such abominations.

On a final note, as awareness of global
warming increases, I would like to see the
Department of Energy devote the 175 billion
planned for Complex 20 over several years to be
used not on weapons, war and killing people, but
on countering climate change. Thank you for your
patience in listening to this. Know, you will be
remembered in the prayers of my Benedictine
monastic community.

MR. SALAZAR: And next we have Joe Carr.

MR. CARR: My name is Joe Carr. I grew
up down at 435 and Holmes. I went to Red Bridge
Elementary down there and went to Center High
School, which is just right next to Bendix. We
can almost throw footballs over the hedges to you
guys.

I grew up very well aware of this plant.
There were lots of rumors about what was made here
and about its role in nuclear weapons production.
And it was very scary. We had read and seen
movies that talked about Kansas City being one of
the first strike places on a list of targets in
case of world war. I believe that given the
significance of the plant and the percentage that
it produces for them, I think it will be. That
very much puts us in danger. The people of this
community are my friends and my family and my
neighbors. And I am really upset that this plant
continues to exist here and continues to threaten
us and make us potential collateral damage and to
destroy our environment. But also that it is part
of threatening the global community and making our
entire country and world less safe. More and more
nuclear weapons only make us less safe. That is
incredibly clear.

So I am glad that you say that you want
to make us safer and that you want to care about
the environment. I don't see how making a new
plant to produce more and more advanced nuclear
weapons is in any way going to make us less safe
or help our environment.

I am really glad to hear that you are
considering tearing down this facility. I think
that is an excellent idea. I think you should
start with a new piece of paper and on that peace
of paper, I would encourage you not to draw more
nuclear weapons and more things that are going to
threaten us, our community or our world, but to
focus on other products that I know you could use
your technologies to make us safer and truly
improve the environment. There are all kinds of
products besides weapons that you could make. So
I encourage you to tear this down and to do that.

Don't tell me that there is nothing you
can do. You very much can do that. You can at
least extend this comment period and make sure the
people of Kansas City have a voice. And continue
to -- so you say you want to be cleaner and make
us more secure, and yet you want to build more
nuclear weapons. I have to wonder if that's
really what you want.

On your very last list of priorities was
profit and making more money. And I have to
wonder if that is really what this is about. If
you really do want to make more money, if that's
all you really care about. Well, it is not all I
care about and it is not all that the people of
Kansas City care about. And it has been clear
that the people of the world and in America care
about more things than just making profit off of
exploiting us and exploiting our people.
I want to remind you that we will
continue to be here and will continue to speak
regardless of what public comment period there is
or not. There have been growing campaigns all
over the world against weapons producers. Because
we are outraged not only that these weapons are
being produced, but that you are profiting from
that and that you are making more money on that.
So I want you to remember that you can
make a difference. And I want everybody here
tonight to remember that we do have a voice and
that we can continue to have an impact on what
these people do. People all over the world and
throughout American history have made change.
And we have been resisting the war in
Iraq since before it started and we have continued
to steadfastly resist that. We are ready to move
on from holding signs on the street corner and
ready to take on the military industrial complex
in our own back yard. So please remember that we
will continue to be here and we will continue to
make our voices heard. Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: Next we have Rachel
MacNair.

MS. MACNAIR: I am Dr. Rachel MacNair.
I got my PhD at UMKC in social psychology. I
listened closely and found that you gave a very
good presentation at the beginning of just what it
is that you are laying out as the process that you
want to do and you gave out good reasoning with
environmental consciousness and great care. But I
noticed that you were referring to everything
having to do with the process except the product.
And I believe you have noticed that the great
majority of the comments have focused on that
point. It has to be present, because the product
itself, you cannot possibly get more
environmentally unsound than a nuclear weapon that
is ever used. Just one.

So the point of it is, well, we have
nuclear weapons for defense and for security. We
do really need to look at what the words "defense" and "security" mean. They are not euphemisms to cover weapons. They mean what they actually mean. What are our major security risks right now? I don't think there is anybody who pays any attention to the news at all that doesn't know that the major security risk is from terrorist's actions of non-governmental terrorist groups. And using nuclear weapons against them would be like trying to use a bulldozer against a cloud of mosquitoes.

There can be no argument that somehow nuclear weapons are going to help us fight Al-Qaeda. But, there are a lot of people who instead of flying airplanes into buildings would love to get their hands on a nuclear weapon. Now, they don't have the capability of making their own nuclear weapons, they don't even begin to come anywhere close. But they are good at things like grabbing and stealing what is there. Now, you can say that we have it very well secured. And I would certainly hope so. But this is the real world. And there is one and only one method that is 100 percent fool-proof to keep terrorists from stealing a nuclear weapon, and that is to not have
a nuclear weapon.

MR. SALAZAR: Next we have John Mueller.

John, before you begin. If I offer you a stool, would that be helpful?

MR. MUELLER: I appreciate your concern. I can assure you that these two metal sticks here represent something akin to a result of mass stupidity on my part a couple weeks ago. Putting certain priorities ahead of things like sleep. So I am without wheels and thankful to be alive.

I am John Mueller. I live in Kansas City, Kansas. I am a servant of God. That's why I am here. On the direct questions that have been raised and points that have been mentioned, I would suggest that in preparing your assessment and possibly the environmental impact statement both, that you look at such immediate concerns as the effect of moving to a new location. I think you said it was either six or eight miles south of the present location. This has a very real change on transportation, on fuel consumption, on -- you mentioned that there would be some changes in the infrastructure for utilities, electrical and sewer and water utilities in that area. All those come with expenses that are sometimes hidden, sometimes
rather well known.

The hidden side of that is what happens to the area you move out of, because there you have weakened the use of transportation, you have weakened the use of the utilities and other things like this, leaving them with less income, less ability to be used effectively. So we are increasing environmental sprawl, urban sprawl by such a thing. And so in your environmental assessment I think that needs to be carefully factored in, particularly looking at the costs of fuel for transportation and things like this, which are only going to go higher. Beyond that immediate thing, I think we all are facing in one way or another looking at the problem that how we frame a question, what we are asking in the question itself often determines the answers we get.

You define some very narrow parameters in your environmental assessment program that you are working on and, therefore, the answers are in some cases predetermined. If we go beyond that piecemeal effect, we will find that sometimes looking beyond the immediate shows a benefit we never thought we would see. Such as in
California, the Davis, California many years ago, some new houses were designed that eliminated completely the central air conditioning. Now that's an area that gets up to 100, 110 degrees in the summer and gets kind of chilly in the winter. They managed to design homes that were fully comfortable throughout the full year without any central air conditioning. But it was about eight or ten steps down the line of things they could change and the previous eight or nine steps all had negative cost benefit analysis until the last one was finally put in and suddenly they said with this additional change we can get rid of this whole area of expense. So that helped.

A piecemeal approach often misses significant benefits. The questions we ask often miss the issues that are most concerned which have been raised by others here, such as the overall world view of what is going on. A silver level is a very low level of energy efficiency and can certainly be far exceeded in current and future plans.

And finally, I suggest to you that the approach is based on a philosophy that puts us as believing, perhaps deluding ourselves into
thinking that we are compassionate, we are
conservative, we are Christian. I submit that if
we were compassionate, we would be looking at the
needs of the poor, the dispossessed, the
downtrodden, those whose homes and voices are
ignored. If we were conservative, we would find
better uses for the money that would be more
beneficial. We would have balanced budgets, as
was a significant portion of one political party's
credo a few years ago.

If we were Christian, we would look at
the teachings of Jesus of Nazareth, who Muslims
and my Muslim friends recognize as a prophet, whom
the Jewish people recognize as a Rabbi, when he
said, "Love your enemies." I do not see us doing
any of those three things as a nation and it
saddens me.

MR. SALAZAR: Next we have Bill Rhoads,
Christian Peacemaker Team.

MR. RHoads: I want to thank you all for
giving us the opportunity for a lot of us
peacemakers to all get in one room and see each
other and hear each other's voices. 1942 I think
you mentioned -- someone mentioned that that was
when this plant was built here in Kansas City.
Well, 1943 I was born here, third generation.
When I was two, my parents moved to our house
where I grew up about two miles north of here near
78th and Troost. So I observed as a young child
all those trucks pulling those Prat and Whitney
engines up Troost to somewhere. World War II was
long gone by the time I was old enough to see
those trucks, but I just wanted to give that
little historical perspective.

I am third generation Kansas City.
Counting my grandkids now that is five generations
here in Kansas City. I have nothing against
people that have moved here that may be from peace
activists from other parts of the country. Thank
you for coming.

But I just wanted you to know that
speaking for myself, and if I ramble too long I
would like to say, as someone else has already
said, not in my name. And if we have to limit our
choices to what has been laid out in front of us,
I think the option of do nothing is the one I
would advocate.

And I would use the analogy, I am
surprised urban sprawl was raised by my friend
John. But I thought of this earlier today. There
is a highway that is being proposed out at 179th Street on the Kansas side to connect over to Cass County. Is that going to increase urban sprawl or limit it? I think it is pretty obvious that all of the highways around here help increase urban sprawl.

You know, when I was growing up at 78th and Troost, I can remember my dad, who was a smoker, we would get in the car once a week and drive down to 85th and Paseo so he could buy cigarettes that didn't have a city sales tax on there. Because 85th Street was the city limits. So we know the city limits have gone a lot further than that. But if you think of the analogy with urban sprawl, the one way to stop urban sprawl is to not build more highways. That is not going to help urban sprawl grow.

So I say if we want to stop war making, we can't build more weapons factories. So that's kind of my simplistic way I think I would advocate for doing nothing.

I would like to mention the Christian Peacemaker Team connection. I think some of the people in the room here know that our loss of Tom Fox that was one of the four Christian Peacemaker
teams people that were kidnapped in Baghdad, he
was the one who was killed, the other three were
released. I went on my first Christian Peacemaker
Team delegation just last November, as Christian
Peacemaker Teams has now taken on the depleted
uranium as a new issue. They haven't taken on
nuclear weapons. We know where the depleted
uranium comes from and I speak against building
another weapons factory.

MR. SALAZAR: Next we have Sheila
Rekdal.

MS. REKDAL: Thank you for hearing all
of the comments today. And thank you, people,
that gave comments. I really appreciated hearing
our side.

I grew up in the home of the nuclear
bomb at Pantex Amarillo, Texas. Pantex. And I
attended several of the meetings like this in
regards to having an environmental impact
statement made for Pantex and it took several
citizens to sue them, Mason Hangar, to get an
environmental impact statement made. I know in
that area, in hearing people from that area that
around Pantex the nuclear waste has polluted the
ground water and there is higher rates of cancer
in that area. Being here, maybe you guys will not
get that nuclear waste, but somebody is going to.
It is those people in Pantex where bombs are made
and stored. Those bombs will have to be
dismantled. That waste has to go somewhere.
Nobody wants it.

At this point, Yucca Mountain in Arizona
is the place where they are building, they have
the big drill drilling into the mountain. Those
people around there, the Goshute Indians, and
those people who live there, they don't want it
either. Nobody wants it. So why are we making
more? It is just idiotic, and it is just stupid.
That is stupidity. That is not ignorance, because
you know what they do.

I was born 16 days after the first
nuclear bombs were dropped in New Mexico. In
Trinity site. And I know what they do. You know
what they do. Why, why would a thinking people,
rational human beings want to develop more nuclear
weapons? That's idiotic. Stupid. There is no
cure for stupidity. And it is for profit, that's
why. That's why. Because people's jobs depend
upon it.

Well, get it turned around. Start
making things that make people's lives better. Improve the quality of life and quit worrying about the quantity of human beings. Improve our quality of life. Make solar energy. Make wind panels. Wind generators. There are things that we can do. The technology is here. Quit making more weapons of mass destruction. Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: Next we have David Mason.

MR. MASON: Good evening. I am David Mason. I am a retired teacher from St. Joseph, Missouri, which is 70 miles north of here. I am also a Priest of the Community of Christ. In all of my nearly 60 years I have lived under the veil of nuclear devices. Probably when they were exploding them in the atmosphere I received a dose of Plutonium 90 as a child, as many of us have. We have been affected by that in ways that we aren't totally aware of.

This is the first time that I have had in my whole life to speak before any type of commission of this sort and so I do appreciate your opening this opportunity to us. And I realize that this facility is intended to produce the non-nuclear components, but still that, as others have said, it contributes to the whole. It
is a great temptation to look at the good aspects of the proposal. The infusion of money into this community. The jobs. The boost to the economy. And say whoopie, let's go. But that is a temptation. And there are other things that could be done with that same amount -- well, that money that is going to be expended here and throughout the country for this purpose is so huge that it could do a whole lot of good.

There are neighborhoods in this city that need to be rebuilt so that children can have a life. So that they can go to school and have some pride and some sense of coming from someplace that might then give them a future. Because there are neighborhoods in this town that do not produce children, very many, that feel a sense of a future.

While money isn't the whole answer, it is a big part. We need transportation across this state in the form of rail transportation. It is a huge expense, we don't have the money in this state for that. The federal government has an excess of money, we can certainly be helped in that way.

From the religious perspective that I am
involved in and have participated in all my life,
there are a couple of things that I wanted to
relate to you and probably most succinctly stated
by a statement from the president of my community,
Steve Vecee, in the last conference that we had.
And if you don't mind I will quote some of that.

This seems to hold up what the true
nature of a Christian nation might be. "Above all
else, strive to be faithful to Christ's vision of
a peaceable kingdom of God on earth. Courageously
challenge cultural and political and religious
trends that are contrary to reconciling and
restoring purposes of God. Pursue peace. There
are subtle, yet powerful influences in the world,
some of them even claiming to represent Christ,
that seek to divide people and nations to
accomplish their destructive aims. That which
seeks to harden one human heart against another by
constructing walls of fear and prejudice is not of
God. Be especially alert to these influences lest
they divide you or divert you from the mission
which you are called. God, the eternity creator,
weeps for the poor, the displaced, the mistreated,
the diseased of the world because of their
unnecessary suffering. Such conditions are not
God's will. Open your ears to hear the pleading
of mothers and fathers in all nations who
desperately seek a future of hope for their
children. Do not turn away from them, for in
their welfare resides your welfare. The earth
lovingly created as an environment for life to
flourish, shudders in distress, because of
creations naturally and living systems are
becoming exhausted from carrying the burden of
human greed and conflict."

Now, I assume that you are all good
people and some of you perhaps even Christian
people. I have always tried in my life to avoid
those endeavors and I think I did so as a teacher.
That would cause me to be in support of those
things that we do not uphold as people of moral
courage or people of moral character. And I would
suggest that you look inside yourselves to that
occupation that you now have and see if that meets
with your own moral and ethical views. If
necessary, then to repent from those and change.
Repentance means change. It doesn't mean that you
are creating some great sin, but think about what
you are doing and if that's where you really want
to be going. Because this all has an effect upon
If I might conclude, when are we going to beat our swords into plowshares? When are we going to realize Isaiah's vision? For many of us, we want it to be now. This country is maybe one of the few in the world that can do this. And we can defend ourselves without the nuclear threat. Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: Next we have John Burris.

MR. BURRIS: Good evening. My name is John Burris. I was born in Kansas City, Kansas in 1936. I am here because, first, I am a citizen of the world. Secondly, I am an Agnostic, so you will hear from the other side. And thirdly, because I am a great grandfather.

I am glad that I don't have to follow the young lady who made the reference to Amarillo and her relationship to nuclear bombs. But I did have an experience that I don't think is shared by too many here tonight.

Because in 1955, some 52 years ago, I was at Camp Desert Rock at Yucca Flat, Nevada, in the trenches with the First Marines Atomic Brigade. So I had a little up close and personal relationship with the nuclear bomb. Bearing in
mind that was a baby bomb. But what it did to the
little equipment those brave and smart Marines set
up out there was unbelievable to me. Because I
was like 19 years old. When you are 19 you got a
lot to learn if you live long enough to do that.
And it saddens me when I watch the Leher Report,
A.K.A. ADM propaganda, when I see the list of the
young men and women who have given their lives.

Yesterday I think the count was 15, and
of the 15, 12 were under 30. I think that
nuclear -- I think that all war is tough. I think
it is all wrong. I don't think that there is any
such thing as a justified war. Especially if you
juxtapose it with other ways of resolving
conflicts and differences.

I understand about that there are many
people here this evening whose jobs are probably
dependent on this business. I retired from
Internal Revenue down the street, so I know how
that goes. But once you sell the soul, your soul
to the master, you still got to live with
yourself. I think that was a judgment of
Nuremberg, wasn't it? I'm not sure so many of us
remember that.

But one of the things that I omitted to
say was that I am also a citizen of the United
States of amnesia and perhaps United States of
Alzheimer's, because we just don't remember
history, if we ever knew it. I think that we are
on a track for suicide. I think that the people
that we call terrorists were what the people that
we also idolized, we called them Minute Men and
Revolutionaries. What is the difference? What
was the lesson of Vietnam? It showed that the
greatest nation in the world couldn't beat some
people who had no tanks. They had bicycles. Who
had whatever. Just small little weapons, but they
had the will. And this is the same thing that my
brothers in Palestine are doing to the Zionists in
Israel. I think we need to take a look at what we
are doing.

I want to compliment you folks with
having this thing here, because it is so
inspirational for me to hear some of the people
from the religious community being here tonight
and saying some things they need to say, which was
the reason why I converted to Agnosticism a long
time ago.

I have heard at least two references to
Eisenhower, talking about the military industrial
complex. I would like to add a couple more, which
would be the academic and the religious complex.
I think that America needs to take a real serious
look at itself. When we talk about terrorism, we
invented terrorism as far as I'm concerned. We
practiced genocide against part of our people, the
Native Americans. And we certainly practiced
slavery and practiced at it against the other
part, my African people. So I don't have any
illusions or delusions about what this country is
all about. You talk about morality. I think the
word would be amoral, because that's what we do.
So I am glad that you are here tonight. It is
really refreshing.

I see a couple faces that I have seen
down on 47th and down at the Nichols Plaza. And I
think it is really great. Because we really need
an awakening. Like I said, I really don't fault
the folks who say, "Well, this is my job," because
what we need to do, we don't need to take a look
at Bush or Rove or Wolfowitz. He is gone. Or
Rice or any of these other folks, because it
starts with us. Our commitment to our comfort
zone and our way of life is what keeps us in deep
trouble.
How much are we really willing to
sacrifice? I think this can be a start. Again I
am inspired to see so many folk here. And I think
it is going to penetrate the little brains of some
of the folk that say, "Well, hey, I have got to
make a living. Because those folks over there in
Iraq and Afghanistan and now Lebanon all over
again, are catching hell and we are the cause of
it. You can't shift that weight. We all have an
investment in this investment. I would like to
thank you for your patience.

MR. SALAZAR: We do have one last
speaker signed up here. David Quinly.

MR. QUINLY: Good evening. I am David
Quinly. I am a native born and raised. I am part
of a -- I guess I am just part of the pissed off
majority in the country that the president and his
administration and now our Congress isn't
listening to.

Some of my thoughts were, I go back to
John Kennedy. In November of '63, November 8th of
'63, three weeks before he was murdered, he signed
an executive order to remove the troops from
Vietnam. He made a speech where he referred to
our, that we all inhabit this small planet, we all
breathe the same air, we all cherish our
children's future, we are all mortal. He did in
that speech a unilateral test ban on nuclear
weapons and he challenged the rest of the world
pending an official treaty to end that. This
madness. And he was dead three weeks later and
Johnson of course escalated the war. And he said
in that speech, "I am confident if we maintain the
peace, that we shall in due season reap the kind
of world we deserve, and deserve the kind of world
we will have." He was moving us towards peace and
elimination of these weapons. And we see where we
are now. He predicted right where we ended up
with this debacle in Iraq or this crime in Iraq.

But I have been thinking outside the
box. I had kind of an idea for this facility. My
thought is when Bush and Chaney are finished
murdering all the Iraqis we can move the
production to that former sovereign nation by
declaring it U.S. territory. The chance of
radioactive contamination then would be moot, in
that the region has already been contaminated by
our use of illegal depleted uranium weapons used
in our Blitzkrieg or Shock and Awe and subsequent
occupation and genocide. We could then claim the
oil for our nation and with Haliburton's help, do
the heavy refining there using our domestic
refineries to simply finish the product
alleviating our refining deficiencies.

The pristine pasture at 150th Highway
and Botts could then host a brand new Wal-Mart, a
couple of Starbucks and a plethora of fast food
venues. Our self-inflicted domestic weapons of
mass destruction. That's all I had to say.

MR. SALAZAR: Now it looks like everyone
who signed up got a chance to speak. I did offer
as we have time remaining, we are scheduled to go
until 9:30. I know at least one person expressed
an interest in maybe continuing to speak. Since
we have it looks like about a little over 45
minutes remaining, we should take a five-minute
break. We have water fountains and restrooms
right outside in the lobby on the right-hand side.
And we will get started again.

(A short recess was taken.)

MR. SALAZAR: As I said, we do have this
meeting going on until 9:30. We have one person
who expressed an interest in continuing to speak,
so I want to allow him that opportunity. If
anyone else wishes to speak, please continue to
sign up on the sheet in the back and I will make
sure we also give you some of the time that we
have remaining.

SPEAKER: Can I ask a question? Can
people come up again to the podium, since this is
our time to 9:30? If we have already commented
but we want something else to add, can we do that?

MR. SALAZAR: If you have already
spoken, please feel free if you want more time to
speak again, to sign up in the back. Right now we
just have one person I think who was our first
speaker who did indicate that he wanted to speak
some more. But if we get others, by all means,
sign up.

Then please let me remind you and
encourage you that we are taking comments in our
first public comment period up until May 30th.
You can mail those to me, e-mail them to me. If
you have this handout here, you will see on the
bottom right-hand corner my address and my e-mail
address where you can send your comments, so we
can incorporate those in our environmental
assessment.

Now, with that, I believe we had Jay.
You kind of scared me. You said you could go on
forever. I did bring the stool. We have the room
until 9:30. If we do get additional speakers I
will ask you to maybe cut yourself short to give
them time.

MR. COGHLAN: I will try not to abuse
that. Sometimes you just get going and things
roll on. Thank you, Mr. Salizar, you are very
congenial. I do want to emphasize the fact that
we are all human beings and I want to thank you
officials as well. I think often that it is
merited that you all hear some tough talk. But
certainly speaking for myself, there is nothing
personal about it.

Now I am somewhat disappointed. I came
here to Kansas City thinking that there might be a
lot of local boosters speaking out in support of
the new plant. I am a little disappointed by the
lack of it. Because I don’t know, I just try to
find my fun where you can find it and preaching to
the choir is not always that much fun.

I did hear the one union official. That
was the one statement of support. And I wanted to
note that because, clearly, jobs are going to be
an issue and human beings need jobs. So it
becomes a matter of what is the appropriate way to
direct those jobs and future employment. And I
don't want to go off on too much of a tangent, but
suffice it to say that this country needs to
reorder its priorities and give people good
beneficial employment and I would like to see the
future Kansas City plant providing that kind of
employment in some kind of a meaningful way.

But then I did want to bring the choir
good news. I previously alluded to the fact that
there is certainly rising debate over the future
course of U.S. nuclear weapons policies. And this
is very much evident in Congress, literally,
today. So right now it is the appropriations
markup for DOE funding in-house appropriations.
And here is a statement issued by the current
chairman, a congressman from Indiana named Peter
Visclosky, which certainly has bearing on this
hearing today. And the first part I pick out of
his statement, he states, "The Department of
Energy has squandered vast sums of money." That's
a nice little start. He goes on to observe, "It
also squanders funding that could have been better
spent on addressing the energy crisis, making
progress on the transformation of the weapons
complex and a number of other areas that are in
need of wise federal investment."

So a lot of the remarks tonight touched on that. Now here is part. Again, this is the
Chairman on the subcommittee in the House for Energy Appropriations. But he says, "There is a
need for a comprehensive nuclear defense strategy to guide transformation downsizing of the
stockpile and nuclear weapons. And until progress is made on this critical issue, there will be no
new facilities or a Reliable Replacement Warhead."

So perhaps the house appropriations subcommittee has already mooted the issues at least for now
that we have discussed right here in this hearing.

Then he goes on to say, "Given the serious international and domestic consequences of the U.S. initiating a new nuclear weapons production activity, it is critical that this administration lay out a comprehensive course of action." I don't think it is asking too much for a comprehensive nuclear strategy before we build a new nuclear weapon.

Finally, he observes, "There is a tremendous legacy of contamination from the past 60 years of nuclear weapons manufacturing. Now is the time to make progress on cleaning up." And
then I will end on that cleaning up issue.

Because in my view, if the NNSA is allowed to follow the course that it wants to follow, what it is going to do is build up nuclear weapons, not clean up.

And under FOIA litigation, I obtained the comprehensive site plans for the Kansas City plant. And I will quote out of the 2006 plan saying, "There is currently no budgetary category to account for the elimination of DOE environmental management funding," that is cleanup funding, "for fiscal year 2007 and beyond." It goes on to observe that the PCB limit has been exceeded 32 times since 1992 here at the old plant. It goes on to say, "When transition occurs," and this is the transition of cleanup funding from DOE environmental management to the NNSA, but "when transition occurs, soil and ground water will still contain VOC's, Petroleum hydrocarbons and PCB's at concentrations similar to those today." So now I kind of nailed these things, two things together. What I want to tell this crowd, is don't let them build up nuclear weapons, and certainly don't let them do that without cleaning up the mess they have made in the
past.

And local folks here, this is as much information as I have on it. But I urge local folks here to really dig into what is the extent of ground water contamination here. And until you know that, and until you compel them to clean it up, certainly do not allow them to build a new nuclear weapons plant. They had to D. and D. a building here. I didn't have the quantities available. They have it.

MR. SALAZAR: We did get a couple of other people signing up wishing to speak. L.D. Harsin.

MR. HARSIN: If I could take another minute. I really appreciated the lady's comments who I met just now in thanking you all for your qualifications, the good work you do. Government is the only thing that represents all of us. You and all your colleagues in this work I realize are working on our behalf and prepared yourselves well. Experienced to do this. In fact, I got my graduate degree in public administration and applied to GAO before I shifted direction. So I hope there is a way somehow to say, as some people are saying, without questioning people's
integrity, to keep doing your job professionally
and in addition to keep thinking of what is good
for the community, our nation and the world.
Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: Next we have Joe Carr.

MR. CARR: When I was growing up around
here, we used to talk about the threats to our
community, the threats to our neighborhoods. And
one of the threats that was brought up a lot was
drug dealers. These people living in our
communities or coming into our communities from
the outside to peddle destruction and unhealthy
lifestyles and profit from it. We thought that
was very disgusting. We grew up hating drug
dealers. What do we do with drug dealers? We
lock them away and come up with some of the worse
punishments for the drug dealers. I think there
are people here who would say that you all and
your company are no different than these drug
dealers. Profiting off of destruction, despair,
poverty.

But I think you are very different. I
think that you are far worse than drug dealers.
Because the drugs that drug dealers sell to people
only harm themselves. And are designed to harm
themselves. Yes, they degrade communities and it
is harmful and it should be stopped. But your
weapons that you produce are made for the explicit
purpose to harm other people and to commit murder
and to commit genocide and to commit environmental
destruction. That will last longer than any
civilization in history has ever lasted. And
unlike drug dealers, you are not driven by poverty
and the need to survive. But the people in your
company and the people making decisions in your
company could easily afford to make alterations in
what you produce and to lose a little money if
necessary. But instead you are driven by
insatiable greed and lust for power that
inevitably leads to murder and genocide.

And so I want you all to remember
international law and I want you to remember the
war crimes tribunals that during times of war, war
criminals never think they are going to be sitting
on.

And in the same way our country says,
well, we're not obliged by international law and
international courts have no authority. But
Hitler said the same thing and other war criminals
have said the same thing. And you all can
continue to say these things to yourselves, oh, I am not responsible, I am just doing my job. But that's what they said at Nuremberg. And we all see the money that you are making and we all see who is responsible. And we will hold you accountable for those war crimes. And in the meantime, I will continue to educate my community and the people around here continue to understand what this, what your proposal means and what you have done and what you are continuing to do and will continue to educate the people of Kansas City who will not stand for this. And will continue to resist this, as we have continued to resist the war in Iraq. And I think that this situation can be a very strong mobilizing force for the activist community in this town as well as anybody who supports peace and environmental justice. And we will continue to resist this. People have blocked bulldozers before and we will continue to block them and continue to resist this plant. Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: Someone else. Ron Faust. You wish to speak this as well?

MR. FAUST: Ron Faust. Just a couple points. You know, I just can't imagine how
responsible it is to build a $18 billion facility
given the fact that we have increased our
indebtedness and pushing towards $9 trillion,
which amounts to about $129,000 for every person
born in America. How in the world can we even be
thinking of this allotment of money? I know the
Federal Reserve can just make more money, but at
some point this credit card mentality has got to
be reined in and be made some sense out of. And
then when we start thinking about what we are
building, you know, what is the purpose of it?
Does it have any redeeming constructive qualities?
It seems to me to be based out of fear.

Now, I know that this facility does not
supposedly have any nuclear radioactivity to it.
I mean, there is a small amount I guess. But, you
know, I have been a minister in the church for a
long time now. And it always was a concern for me
that as long as human beings are vulnerable, and
we have not figured out how to store radioactivity
that lasts for years upon years upon years, it
doesn't go away. Why we play roulette with that.
It just seems to me that as rational human beings,
and as ethical courageous people, we have just got
to say that's not where we ought to be. Thank
MR. SALAZAR: Please come up.

MR. MUELLER: John Mueller. Thank you for the chance to add piggyback to some of the things that have been said and expand a little on a comment I made earlier. There is a real tendency for us to divide questions into smaller units and smaller units and smaller units and then try to solve that one and then go on to the next, compartmentalizing our questions. The risk of doing that is that you sometimes lose the view of the whole. The analogy so well stated is that you fail to see the forest because you are looking so closely at the tree trunks. Or you fail to see what an elephant is because all you are observing is just a leg.

In doing the process that you are going through, the analysis, the assessment, the possible impact statement, you are working within the limits of what you have been told to work with by the rules, by the laws, by whatever are defined.

The questions, as I said earlier, define what you are expected to come up with answers to. I certainly encourage you in doing this to look at
the larger issues beyond just the immediate impact
of this particular plant, this particular
facility, this particular project. To look at the
bigger picture of how this relates to other
projects. As speakers have said this evening, how
this relates to the world. It is saddening that
we end up in this compartmentalizing to get to the
point where we are just pushing a button or just
signing a paper and deluding ourselves into
thinking that we are not therefore responsible for
what that button did.

The steps that it takes to get to the
point of doing a Holocaust sort of experience are
those steps. You depersonalize the other. You
make it so that you and another person are two
distinct groups. You make that person's group to
be less important, less valuable than yourselves.
You make it so that you are only following
somebody else's decisions, somebody else's orders,
somebody else's instructions. All I am doing is
this one little thing. And before you know it,
you have found yourself to be inhuman. So I pray
and hope that in doing these studies that you are
doing, that you are looking at, as much as
possible, these larger questions. The questions
that go beyond just what the law says you are
supposed to look at. Because the law brings
death.

MR. SALAZAR: From what I can see, we
have everyone who has wished to speak has spoken.
We do have a little bit of time left here to 9:30.
Not very much. So please, if you wish to have
further comments, I do always encourage you to
provide them in written format or you can e-mail
me. You have my information. I will continue to
stay here until 9:30. If we have someone else who
would like to speak. We have a couple people. So
just realize we are kind of winding down. If we
have more than one person, we do want to allow
them.

MS. BURDICK: I am Amrita Burdick. I
just would like to ask for a couple of minutes of
silence. A couple of minutes of holding the focus
of holding the best for humanity, the best for our
community. I would just like to ask for that
couple of minutes, if people would be willing to
do so.

(Two minutes of silence.)

MS. BURDICK: Thank you.

MR. SALAZAR: I think we had a speaker.
MS. DELAMARET: Is it okay? I didn't sign anything.

MR. SALAZAR: We always try to capture everyone. Please state your name.

MS. DELAMARET: I will make it quick.

MR. SALAZAR: We want to make sure we get people for the record.

MS. DELAMARET: Just for the record, I think it should be not just the environmental assessment, that it needs to be the whole environmental impact study. Obviously building something out there is going to change that environment. It will -- there will be various forms of pollution just basically associated not only with the construction process but also with the operation of the plant. And a cursory look at that from a very high level does not seem to be -- would not be adequate, and therefore it should be the full study.

I guess also, what I really wanted to say more than that, is that perhaps you can understand our concerns about what is going on here. You can turn on the T.V. and listen to candidates who sing songs about bombing other countries. And that's not just one political
party. The other party refuses to say that
certain things are off the table. And we all know
what that means. And they are running on it. Our
front runners are running on the threat.

Now, perhaps you can understand why you
got people up here a little upset and some of them
say kind of harsh, moral things to you. It is not
an illusion. It is very possible. It can happen.
They get patted on the back for it. People give
them money to say these things. How far will it
go? When you make the bombs easier to use and
more efficient? There will come situations in
which tactical -- for tactical reasons it will
eventually happen and that's why we're trying to
capture it. And that's why we're trying to
get you to think about what you are doing. Thank
you.

MR. SALAZAR: And if you wish, could
you, if you want to state your name for the record
so we can capture it.

MS. DELAMARET: It is Patriska
DeLamaret.

MS. FOGELSONG: Hi. My name is Karen
Fogelsong. And I found out about this kind of at
the very last minute through a forward from the
PeaceWorks. It is actually my first time kind of
attending something like this. I have been a
volunteer and I have been a participant speaking
out, but never kind of been to something like
this. So bear with me on being a little bit
green.

I can't help but to say that I am a
little overwhelmed and kind of sick at my stomach.
I don't think there is one person in the room,
whether you are for this or against it, that is
not going to go home and think about the things
that were discussed this evening. And I wasn't
planning on standing up and speaking, but here I
am. So I will just kind of do the best that I
can.

I am interested, since I didn't know
about this and many of the people that I forwarded
it to and spoke to today did not know about it. I
was under the impression that the media was going
to be here this evening, but lo and behold they
didn't show up tonight.

Two of them, one station had a teacher
that had committed a crime, was what they were
attending to this evening, and a public worker in
Oak Grove that was fired for something. I feel
that this deems a little bit more getting some
information out so people are aware of just what is going on. I think there is probably a lot of people that don't even know what this facility has done for years up until now. I would like to see and know how another hearing can be made. And you have already set some time lines down, it seems very well in order during the presentation that you spoke as if the facility is ready for planning actions for deployment as if this has already gone through. I think there are a lot of people who would be unhappy about this. I think there are a lot of people in this city that aren't aware of what is going on. I am interested in how a person as green as me is able to get some information, some answers, and how you provide getting some answers out that are not biased and how maybe there could be another event where the media is there. Or someone from The Star. Because from what I understand, the bit of information that was out about this announcement was in small print somewhere in the newspaper. If we can cover all the other murders that are going on around this city, then certainly we can cover getting some information out about this. So how would we get answers?
MR. SALAZAR: We do have one other speaker. We have kind of six or seven minutes left. We are providing a draft environmental assessment. We are kind of at the beginning of our process. We will make that available to the public.

MS. MADDEN: My name is Molly Madden. I am a city bus driver and we really need light rail. We need more people to ride the transit. But I was noticing on a PBS special that Germany has gone 20 percent solar and wind. So we could make more solar panels. I think they said we were less than one percent solar and wind. We have got a long way to go. So I would like to see the money spent on things like light rail, solar, wind, that kind of thing. More progressive things. Thank you.

SPEAKER: My thoughts are not yet fully formed, but I think of the word of "empire". And there is a lot of books that have come out about the United States as the empire. And when I look at the organizations that I hear that are represented, the Pentagon, the Department of Energy, the National Nuclear Security Information, the Department of Military, the General Services
Administration, you are, and I think you all know, you are part of this empire that wants to control the world. And the way we control the world was the way -- the empire wants to control the world is, you know, we're going to build nuclear weapons whether the Americans want them or not. And I am just appalled at the hubris, the arrogance of what your organizations stand for. It has nothing to do about democracy. It has to do about capitalism, globalization, empire building. And that's what you are all about.

And I don't mean to make judgments, but I am just wondering how you go to bed at night. And how do you think about -- I mean, as parents, are you not thinking about your children? Are you not thinking about your grandchildren? What are you thinking about? Are you in touch with reality? I don't know what else to say. I am just -- I am deeply hurt by this process, because I feel like we are David fighting Goliath. And I still have the hope that as David, the truth, our truth can stand up against the falsehood of your empire that is hopefully going to crumble so that the rest of the human community can live in peace and with dignity. Thank you.
MR. SALAZAR: It looks like we are almost right at the end here. I do want to make aware that this ends at 9:30. So if you do need to use the restroom or anything on the way out, we are going to keep the building open for a few minutes. Please do so at this time. We have maybe three minutes or so left. If there is anyone else who wants to go. As I see people walking out, I just want to thank you very much for your participation and attendance here. It is very beneficial to hear all your public comments.
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