

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING

MAY 23, 2007

6:30 p.m. to 9:30 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF PUBLIC HEARING

In Re: Scoping Meeting - Construction of new facilities to relocate NNSA's non-nuclear component procurement and manufacturing operations.

Held at the Plaza Auditorium, Bannister Federal Complex, 1500 East Bannister Road, in Kansas City, Missouri.

A P P E A R A N C E S:

- Mr. Carlos Salazar, GSA NEPA Coordinator
- Mr. Bill Boos, GSA Deputy Director of Portfolio Management
- Ms. Elizabeth Noakes, PSI, Inc
- Mr. Mark Holecek, NNSA Deputy Site Manager
- Mr. Brad Scott, GSA Regional Administrator
- Mr. Curtis Roth, NNSA NEPA Compliance Officer

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

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

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

17 (Off the record.)

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

23 If you have not done so and you wish to
24 speak, make public comments later on in the
25 meeting, please do so at the registration desk

1 right outside. And then of course if you have
2 comments that you want to turn in for written
3 comments, we have Bill Boos here who is our
4 official document manager. You can turn in any
5 written comments there. Thank you.

6 (Off the record.)

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

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

1 operations.

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

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

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

22 MR. SALAZAR: We will have an
23 opportunity after we do our opening remarks and
24 presentations for public comments. So if you have
25 a comment such as that, you can make them at that

1 time. You will also see my e-mail address up
2 there. It is on the handouts that we have outside
3 as well. I am the GSA presiding official over
4 this meeting today.

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

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

22 Now, we will have a draft of the
23 assessment. We expect to have a draft published
24 in August. I know as some people have asked to
25 extend the comment period, I do want to make you

1 aware that after we publish this draft and
2 environmental assessment we will have a second
3 comment period for people to send in comments that
4 will last for 30 days. A final environmental
5 assessment then would be published after that,
6 which we are currently projecting around
7 September.

8 Now, a proposed new facility for the
9 Kansas City plant would be located approximately
10 eight miles south of the existing plant on an
11 undeveloped site at the northwest corner of
12 Missouri Highway 150 and Botts Road. That is in
13 Kansas City, Missouri in District Number 5. GSA
14 would lease the facilities to NNSA, which would
15 relocate its non-nuclear operations from the
16 existing Kansas City plant here in the Bannister
17 Federal Complex. And the relocation would involve
18 moving about two-thirds of the existing capital
19 and process equipment to the new facility. Now,
20 disposition activities of the existing NNSA
21 facilities at the Kansas City plant are not part
22 of the current proposed action and will be
23 addressed in appropriate future environmental
24 analysis. The Kansas City plant is co-located
25 with the Bannister Federal Complex, with GSA, and

1 disposition activities will require coordination
2 between both GSA and NNSA.

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

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

20 Another alternative is renovate the
21 existing GSA office here and warehouse space at
22 the Bannister Federal Complex and then relocating
23 NNSA's non-nuclear operations to the renovated
24 facilities here and conduct the future operations
25 in this facility.

1 Another alternative is renovating
2 existing GSA office space up in front, and
3 actually demolishing existing GSA warehouse space
4 and constructing and operating a new manufacturing
5 facility on the GSA portion of the Bannister
6 Federal Complex. Another alternative is just
7 demolishing existing GSA office and warehouse
8 space. So demolishing the entire GSA site here
9 and constructing and operating a new office and
10 manufacturing facility on GSA's portion of the
11 Bannister Federal Complex.

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

18 Now, NNSA intends to adopt this
19 environmental assessment for use as a basis of
20 decisions regarding the further transformation and
21 downsizing of non-nuclear production activities
22 performed at the Kansas City plant. This
23 assessment is being prepared pursuant to the
24 National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, and
25 regulations implementing the above by the Council

1 on Environmental Quality, also known as the CEQ.

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

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

22 DOE completed -- let me give you a
23 little bit of a history here. DOE completed a
24 nuclear weapons complex reconfiguration, Complex
25 21 study in January of 1991, which identified

1 significant cost savings that could be achieved by
2 downsizing the nuclear weapons complex. On
3 January 27th, 1992, the Department of Energy
4 issued a notice of intent to prepare an
5 environmental assessment for the consolidation of
6 non-nuclear production activities within the
7 nuclear weapons complex. On September 14th, 1993,
8 the Department of Energy published a finding of no
9 significant impact regarding its proposal to
10 eliminate -- proposal to terminate non-nuclear
11 production missions at the Pantax Plant in Ohio,
12 the Pinellas Plant in Florida, the Rocky Flats
13 Plant in Colorado, and consolidate the electrical
14 and mechanical manufacturing functions here at the
15 Kansas City plant.

16 The Department of Energy issued a notice
17 of intent on June 6, 1995; final Stockpile
18 Stewardship and Management, Programmatic,
19 Environmental Impact statements on November 19th,
20 1996; and a record of decision on December 26th,
21 1996, announcing its decision to transform the
22 weapons production complex by further downsizing
23 the nuclear weapons complex. This decision
24 included reducing non-nuclear component
25 fabrication capacity here at the Kansas City

1 plant. In these documents the Department of
2 Energy evaluated alternatives for the
3 consolidation of non-nuclear manufacturing,
4 storage, surveillance functions of the nuclear
5 weapons complex to the Kansas City plant and
6 reducing the capacity for non-nuclear component
7 fabrication. The proposed action will continue
8 the consolidation and downsizing of non-nuclear
9 activities at the Kansas City plant which was
10 begun in the early 1990's.

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

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

1 resources and infrastructure.

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

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

20 Now, I have invited Mark Holecek and
21 Brad Scott here to provide an overview of the
22 Kansas City Plant Project and discuss GSA's role
23 in the real estate transactions. So with that, we
24 are very pleased to have Mark kick off this
25 action.

1 MR. HOLECEK: Thank you, Carlos. NNSA
2 and GSA have entered into a partnership to move
3 forward with this project. And I wanted to take
4 this opportunity to thank GSA for all they have
5 done to help us and move us forward.

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

19 This is a picture of the Bannister
20 Federal Complex. Right now you are sitting right
21 about here. The building is a very large
22 building, the main building. It spans this area
23 here. This half of the facility is GSA space.
24 And NNSA controls this space over here. The
25 building directly to the east of us is what used

1 to be the IRS service facility, which recently has
2 transformed their operations and moved into town.

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

12 The other thing that I would like to
13 point out about this map is to the south of the
14 facility and along the east side we have a flood
15 protection system. The reason for that is that
16 this facility, the entire facility is in the
17 100-Year Floodplain. So when the river comes up
18 this protection system is intended to keep the
19 waters out.

20 Now, when we started working on this
21 project we evaluated various different options and
22 came up with a set of options that we felt were
23 reasonable to proceed with. One of those --
24 several of those options Carlos mentioned earlier.
25 They primarily look at this portion of the

1 facility. The reason for that is that we don't
2 have enough vacant space to just build a new
3 facility on vacant space on the complex. The
4 options that we are looking at on the GSA side
5 include renovation of this space, tearing down the
6 manufacturing space and renovating the office
7 space or just creating an entirely new facility in
8 that space.

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

19 As mentioned before, we have mechanical,
20 electronic and engineering material factories.
21 And we are unique in that aspect in the country
22 that we have all of those activities under one
23 roof and the capabilities and capacities that we
24 have. We also have support functions, we have the
25 analytical and test labs and high performance

1 computing within the building.

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

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

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

1 variable cost environmental facility.

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

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

20 We feel there are a large number of
21 benefits we will gain from making this transition.
22 We want to size the facility for our workload for
23 our mission. In our current facility we have a
24 lot of unutilized space, a lot of
25 underutilized-equipment. We would like to move to

1 a facility where we are sized for the current
2 mission. At one time in this factory we had about
3 9,000 people working under one roof. Today we
4 have about 2,500. So that gives you a sense of
5 the scope of the change of our mission over time.

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

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

20 Another benefit from the project is we
21 will have more flexible and responsive space in
22 the new facility. The facility we have today, we
23 have a lot of what we call monuments. We have
24 roof penetrations, floor penetrations, large
25 pieces of equipment can't be moved very easily

1 within the facility. But as our mission changes
2 we want to be able to easily reconfigure and not
3 have to do a construction project essentially to
4 change our layouts. We are implementing a concept
5 that we call white space. Essentially what that
6 is is open space within the new facility where
7 when we want to reconfigure, we have a space to
8 move to and we continuously keep some space for
9 that approach.

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

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

1 to Brad, who will talk about the GSA portion of
2 the project.

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

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

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

1 some 22 million square feet.

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

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

24 GSA will conduct a full and open
25 competition for the Competition In Contracting Act

1 to select a developer to build a new facility.
2 The selected developer will construct a building
3 to NNSA specifications while overseen by GSA.
4 Selection of the winning proposal will be based on
5 greatest value to the government. GSA enters into
6 the lease contract on behalf of the government,
7 oversees construction to assure compliance with
8 the specifications, and it administers the lease
9 over the lease term.

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

19 Finally, I would note that as a part of
20 GSA's mission and responsibility, a redeployment
21 of this facility will be of paramount importance
22 to us. As was mentioned, GSA owns some 2 million
23 square feet on the west end of the complex and
24 NNSA owns some 3.2 million square feet. From the
25 inception of our relationship and engagement with

1 NNSA, we were committed to working together for
2 the redeployment as a whole where that made the
3 most sense. What will likely happen once NNSA is
4 able to move into the new facility and the current
5 complex is cleaned to city, county, state and
6 federal specifications, they will then convey the
7 property to GSA for redeployment.

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

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

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

24 Now, we are about to start our public
25 comment period. Before we do so, let me again

1 point out that we have restrooms and water
2 fountains outside in the lobby, if you exit to
3 your right. And if you have not done so and you
4 wish to provide public comments, please register
5 at the table outside. There is a sign-up sheet
6 located directly outside this auditorium. And at
7 this time we will go ahead and begin taking public
8 comments.

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

16 Now, as I call your name, please
17 approach the center podium and offer your
18 comments. I ask that you keep your comments to no
19 more than three minutes. Speak slowly so we can
20 have our reporter capture all your comments for
21 the record. And if you would, please state your
22 name and/or represented organization in case I
23 can't quite make it out here. And then if you
24 have a written statement that you are reading from
25 and you wish to enter it into the record, you can

1 hand that over to Bill Boos sitting right beside
2 me here. The first person here is Jay --

3 SPEAKER: Coghlan.

4 MR. SALAZAR: There we go.

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

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

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

17 And the first thing that I would point
18 out to the crowd, it is somewhat obvious, but
19 needs noting. You hear all of these technical
20 details. Everything sounds nice. Of course what
21 is really going on is a national and international
22 debate over the future of nuclear weapons. And
23 one of the many reasons I am interested in the
24 Kansas City plant, you know, first of all, I want
25 to give credit where credit is due. I am struck

1 that the plant actually seems well run. Which is
2 refreshing after Los Alamos for example. So I
3 give you credit there. On the other hand, you
4 guys and gals are front and center in the nuclear
5 weapons complex cranking out 85 percent of all
6 components that go into the U.S. stockpile.

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

23 Now, so here is this debate going. And
24 you know, you can probably deduce in advance that
25 I am not exactly a fan of Henry Kissinger, but yet

1 it is remarkable that we now have very high-level
2 ex-officials calling for a world free of nuclear
3 weapons. That's what we have to do. And we can't
4 go talking to other countries to tell them to get
5 rid of theirs while the other sites, and the brand
6 new environmentally certified Kansas City plant
7 starts cranking out new weapons. So enough on
8 that wrap. Of course I am going to run out of
9 time. You just call it when the time comes,
10 because I can go on ad nauseum. But to get down
11 to NEPA.

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

23 MR. SALAZAR: Your three minutes are up,
24 sir. So if you could wrap it up in a few seconds.
25 If we have to -- we have a lot of people here, so

1 I want to make sure that everyone gets the chance
2 to speak. If we have time at the end, I will
3 invite you to come back up. It's clear you have a
4 lot to say.

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

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

24 So in any event, I look forward to
25 continuing this dialogue with you all. I will

1 bore you with very extensive written comments that
2 hopefully will compel you to come up with many
3 cogent answers. So thank you.

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

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

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

20 Here is the problem. The Kansas City
21 plant's ten-year plan states that the plant is
22 aggressively evaluating transformation options
23 that could be completed on a timeline to support
24 qualification of the Reliable Replacement Warhead
25 or RRW program.

1 The RRW is a new generation of nuclear
2 weapons that will replace the cold war nuclear
3 weapons stockpile. So here is my comment. Please
4 let us not forget our moral and ethical compass.
5 Further nuclear armament is amoral and unethical.
6 It is fallacious reasoning to assert that the
7 world will be safer by building a new generation
8 of nuclear weapons.

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

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

24 MS. NELSON: My name is Patricia Nelson,
25 and I am the Vice Chairperson of PeaceWorks Kansas

1 City. As Corva told you, we have been in
2 existence for 25 years. And we are an
3 anti-nuclear organization and our affiliation is
4 with Peace Action out of Washington, D.C.

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

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

20 The fallout from these weapons would
21 kill thousands of innocent people including, I
22 dare say, some U.S. citizens as well. There are
23 no victors, only victims in a nuclear war. As
24 other countries see us building new nuclear
25 weapons, it will only force them to do the same,

1 thus restarting the cold war. We should get on
2 with building a sustainable future for the world's
3 people and stop this us versus them mentality
4 before it destroys us all. Thank you.

5 MR. SALAZAR: Next I see two people.
6 Jane Stoever and Henry Stoever.

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

13 The 10-year plan of the Kansas City
14 plant calls for the new plant to support the
15 Reliable Replacement Warhead program, the next
16 generation of nuclear weaponry. Such weapons
17 could not exist without the Kansas City nuclear
18 plant. The commitment to expand it instead of
19 squash nuclear weapons, however, is the first
20 reason the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists this
21 January moved its Doms Day Clock from seven
22 minutes to midnight to five minutes to midnight.
23 Something that I imagine you all are familiar
24 with. And I have the statement of their board of
25 directors attached to my own statement here. They

1 were signifying the danger that nuclear weapons
2 and other elements such as climate change pose to
3 the entire world.

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

23 The directors' statement also documents
24 nuclear false alarms that have included four times
25 in '79, '80, '83 and '95. Either the U.S. or

1 Soviet Russian forces were placed on the highest
2 alert and missile launch crews were given
3 preliminary launch warnings. In other words,
4 accidental launches could happen through
5 programming for the event of an attack all by
6 mistake. It goes without saying that nuclear
7 weapons serve as a magnet to terrorists who may
8 misuse them and commit horrendous devastation with
9 them.

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

21 MR. STOEVER: I am Henry Stoever, a
22 practicing attorney for the last 25 years in state
23 and federal court. My criticism of this process
24 is that there should be prior full disclosure by
25 the government, by the agencies and by the

1 operators. Since I believe it is 1949 you have
2 been operating a plant here. There should be
3 volumes of records as to how you have treated the
4 air, and the ground, the ground water, what
5 mistakes have been made. In order for the public
6 to fully understand and to fully be able to
7 comment, that information should be disclosed
8 first.

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

20 Currently this Bush administration is
21 going backwards and is out of step with the past
22 30 years. They have refused to extend treaties,
23 they have attempted to renegotiate treaties, and
24 they are creating further tension by this new
25 development in nuclear technology. Many have

1 rejected the Bush administration because of its
2 harmful and dangerous policies.

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

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

20 MR. SALAZAR: Our next speaker is
21 Charles Carney.

22 MR. CARNEY: Carney. Good evening. My
23 name is Charles Carney. I am a concerned citizen
24 and I live in Kansas City, Kansas. Let's not
25 forget that the Reliable Replacement Warhead is a

1 new family of new warheads intended to simplify
2 the design of the current arsenal. The Department
3 of Energy asserts that this new family of weapons
4 will not have to be tested. I cannot imagine that
5 the Pentagon will deploy nuclear weapons that have
6 never been tested. Let's face reality. The
7 testing of these new nuclear weapons will release
8 dangerous, toxic radiation into the environment.
9 In the name of humanity I object. And I am proud
10 to go on record and saying not in my name.

11 MR. SALAZAR: Next speaker is Ron Faust.

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

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

23 We the people would ask if we would
24 learn anything about heeding Eisenhower's warning
25 that every missile that is made signifies a theft

1 from the poor. His conclusion that this is not a
2 healthy way of life, this military industrial
3 complex, that ultimately drains our soul of joy
4 and life.

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

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

25 MR. SALAZAR: Forgive me if I can't --

1 it is maybe Diana Constantineau.

2 MS. CONSTANTINEAU: Donna Constantineau.

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

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

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

25 In regard to the National Nuclear

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

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

16 And I would like to end by reminding
17 everyone about our U.S. obligation to the Article
18 6 of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, which
19 is that we should be moving toward complete
20 disarmament. And I am going to quote -- Jay
21 referred to Henry Kissinger and others quote from
22 the Wall Street Journal. This was January 4th.
23 George Schultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger and
24 Sam Nunn wrote, "Nuclear weapons to date present
25 tremendous danger and also an historic

1 opportunity. The U.S. leadership is required to
2 take the world to the next stage to a solid
3 consensus, reversing reliance on nuclear weapons
4 globally as a vital contribution to preventing
5 proliferation into potentially dangerous hands and
6 ultimately ending them as a threat to the world."

7 MR. SALAZAR: Our next speaker is John
8 Long.

9 MS. LONG: Make that Jonne.

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

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

21 First I would like to say that I have no
22 ill will toward any of the many fine and capable
23 people who work for the National Nuclear Security
24 Administration Kansas City plant, or any of you
25 who are from GSA and other related things. You

1 are all very excellent and capable people. You
2 are doing your best toward an excellent mission
3 statement. You have a reputation for excellence
4 in all that you do. I know a few people who have
5 or are working out here.

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

16 My concern, however, is with the
17 production of nuclear weapons. Unfortunately the
18 work that your plant does, while non-nuclear in
19 nature, does support nuclear weapons industry. A
20 nuclear weapon, as has already been pointed out,
21 wouldn't be operable without the 85 percent of its
22 components made here. It is my understanding that
23 the proposed new plant will continue to make
24 components for this new generation of nuclear
25 weapons. Nuclear weapons are, as has also been

1 pointed out, very hazardous to the environment.
2 Not only just locally but for the United States
3 and for the world.

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

15 Our children, our grandchildren and all
16 the future generations are depending on us to do
17 the right thing within our limited resources.
18 Thank you.

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

22 MS. WILLENBORG: My name is Dawn
23 Willenborg. I live and work as a volunteer at the
24 Shalom Catholic Worker House in Kansas City,
25 Kansas. We are a homeless shelter for 25 men.

1 I am here as a U.S. citizen and a citizen of the
2 world. I find it very difficult to imagine how a
3 facility that creates components that support
4 nuclear warheads can fail to have an environmental
5 impact if not here, certainly elsewhere. And I
6 cannot support that. I also cannot support the
7 hypocrisy of a nation who wishes to continue to
8 increase our nuclear capabilities while
9 threatening others who attempt to develop them.
10 Thank you.

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

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

1 waste.

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

12 MR. SALAZAR: Pat Kenoyer.

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

18 My statement. Kansas City must not be
19 part of plans to increase production of nuclear
20 weapons. We must not continue to contribute to
21 the evil system which equates power and
22 international prestige with the possession of
23 these most effective methods of death and
24 lingering contamination. Some United States
25 communities are saying no to the nuclear arsenal

1 buildup. We join them in saying no to any part of
2 these plans. We must not foster fear and wasteful
3 expense in the name of security. Real security
4 consists in a sustainable environment which
5 protects all our natural resources. I was glad
6 that you think about the flora and the fauna, and
7 I'm sure you think of the human beings also.

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

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

1 extinction. Thank you.

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

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

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

20 And I am enclosing with my written
21 statement an article from the Kansas City Star on
22 May 13th, 2007, which cites \$2.6 billion paid over
23 five years by the Labor Department's office of
24 Workers' Compensation Program to workers who
25 develop cancer from exposure to radiation at

1 nuclear facilities. And I would like to read from
2 this article, if I may.

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

22 We need to convert our military and
23 nuclear industries into the production of civilian
24 goods and services. Like Johnny mentioned, solar
25 panels, windmills, public transportation, new

1 automobiles that do not emit carbon dioxide from
2 the atmosphere.

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

11 MR. SALAZAR: Next we have Barbara
12 McCracken.

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

21 I would like to share with you a little
22 information on the current teaching of the
23 Catholic church toward the possibility of a new
24 generation of nuclear weapons. There are those
25 who believe the Catholic church has lost some of

1 its credibility to speak on social issues, due to
2 the sexual abuse scandals. However, the church is
3 still highly involved in the full spectrum of life
4 issues, teaching that all people and all of
5 creation is made in God's image. The church
6 constantly reminds all people of good will to have
7 at least enough love and respect for what God has
8 made, not to kill or destroy it. For those who
9 accept this, the possibility of using nuclear
10 weapons is unthinkable. The Holy sea has
11 numerous -- that is the Vatican. Has numerous
12 statements regarding nuclear weapons.

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

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

22 Two, we need to create a climate of
23 confidence and cooperation with other nations.
24 Nothing less than our collective security as a
25 human family is at stake. The U.S. needs to pay

1 more attention to treaties, to reduce and
2 eliminate these weapons of mass destruction. This
3 would furnish a legal basis for international
4 verification under the auspices of the
5 International Atomic Energy Agency. It would also
6 assist in the elimination of nuclear weapons.

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

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

23 MR. SALAZAR: And next we have Joe Carr.

24 MR. CARR: My name is Joe Carr. I grew
25 up down at 435 and Holmes. I went to Red Bridge

1 Elementary down there and went to Center High
2 School, which is just right next to Bendix. We
3 can almost throw footballs over the hedges to you
4 guys.

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

24 So I am glad that you say that you want
25 to make us safer and that you want to care about

1 the environment. I don't see how making a new
2 plant to produce more and more advanced nuclear
3 weapons is in any way going to make us less safe
4 or help our environment.

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

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

25 On your very last list of priorities was

1 profit and making more money. And I have to
2 wonder if that is really what this is about. If
3 you really do want to make more money, if that's
4 all you really care about. Well, it is not all I
5 care about and it is not all that the people of
6 Kansas City care about. And it has been clear
7 that the people of the world and in America care
8 about more things than just making profit off of
9 exploiting us and exploiting our people.

10 I want to remind you that we will
11 continue to be here and will continue to speak
12 regardless of what public comment period there is
13 or not. There have been growing campaigns all
14 over the world against weapons producers. Because
15 we are outraged not only that these weapons are
16 being produced, but that you are profiting from
17 that and that you are making more money on that.

18 So I want you to remember that you can
19 make a difference. And I want everybody here
20 tonight to remember that we do have a voice and
21 that we can continue to have an impact on what
22 these people do. People all over the world and
23 throughout American history have made change.

24 And we have been resisting the war in
25 Iraq since before it started and we have continued

1 to steadfastly resist that. We are ready to move
2 on from holding signs on the street corner and
3 ready to take on the military industrial complex
4 in our own back yard. So please remember that we
5 will continue to be here and we will continue to
6 make our voices heard. Thank you.

7 MR. SALAZAR: Next we have Rachel
8 MacNair.

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

24 So the point of it is, well, we have
25 nuclear weapons for defense and for security. We

1 do really need to look at what the words "defense"
2 and "security" mean. They are not euphemisms to
3 cover weapons. They mean what they actually mean.
4 What are our major security risks right now? I
5 don't think there is anybody who pays any
6 attention to the news at all that doesn't know
7 that the major security risk is from terrorist's
8 actions of non-governmental terrorist groups. And
9 using nuclear weapons against them would be like
10 trying to use a bulldozer against a cloud of
11 mosquitoes.

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

1 a nuclear weapon.

2 MR. SALAZAR: Next we have John Mueller.
3 John, before you begin. If I offer you a stool,
4 would that be helpful?

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

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

1 rather well known.

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

19 You define some very narrow parameters
20 in your environmental assessment program that you
21 are working on and, therefore, the answers are in
22 some cases predetermined. If we go beyond that
23 piecemeal effect, we will find that sometimes
24 looking beyond the immediate shows a benefit we
25 never thought we would see. Such as in

1 California, the Davis, California many years ago,
2 some new houses were designed that eliminated
3 completely the central air conditioning. Now
4 that's an area that gets up to 100, 110 degrees in
5 the summer and gets kind of chilly in the winter.
6 They managed to design homes that were fully
7 comfortable throughout the full year without any
8 central air conditioning. But it was about eight
9 or ten steps down the line of things they could
10 change and the previous eight or nine steps all
11 had negative cost benefit analysis until the last
12 one was finally put in and suddenly they said with
13 this additional change we can get rid of this
14 whole area of expense. So that helped.

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

23 And finally, I suggest to you that the
24 approach is based on a philosophy that puts us as
25 believing, perhaps deluding ourselves into

1 thinking that we are compassionate, we are
2 conservative, we are Christian. I submit that if
3 we were compassionate, we would be looking at the
4 needs of the poor, the dispossessed, the
5 downtrodden, those whose homes and voices are
6 ignored. If we were conservative, we would find
7 better uses for the money that would be more
8 beneficial. We would have balanced budgets, as
9 was a significant portion of one political party's
10 credo a few years ago.

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

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

20 MR. RHOADS: I want to thank you all for
21 giving us the opportunity for a lot of us
22 peacemakers to all get in one room and see each
23 other and hear each other's voices. 1942 I think
24 you mentioned -- someone mentioned that that was
25 when this plant was built here in Kansas City.

1 Well, 1943 I was born here, third generation.
2 When I was two, my parents moved to our house
3 where I grew up about two miles north of here near
4 78th and Troost. So I observed as a young child
5 all those trucks pulling those Prat and Whitney
6 engines up Troost to somewhere. World War II was
7 long gone by the time I was old enough to see
8 those trucks, but I just wanted to give that
9 little historical perspective.

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

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

23 And I would use the analogy, I am
24 surprised urban sprawl was raised by my friend
25 John. But I thought of this earlier today. There

1 is a highway that is being proposed out at 179th
2 Street on the Kansas side to connect over to Cass
3 County. Is that going to increase urban sprawl or
4 limit it? I think it is pretty obvious that all
5 of the highways around here help increase urban
6 sprawl.

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

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

22 I would like to mention the Christian
23 Peacemaker Team connection. I think some of the
24 people in the room here know that our loss of Tom
25 Fox that was one of the four Christian Peacemaker

1 teams people that were kidnapped in Baghdad, he
2 was the one who was killed, the other three were
3 released. I went on my first Christian Peacemaker
4 Team delegation just last November, as Christian
5 Peacemaker Teams has now taken on the depleted
6 uranium as a new issue. They haven't taken on
7 nuclear weapons. We know where the depleted
8 uranium comes from and I speak against building
9 another weapons factory.

10 MR. SALAZAR: Next we have Sheila
11 Rekdal.

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

16 I grew up in the home of the nuclear
17 bomb at Pantex Amarillo, Texas. Pantex. And I
18 attended several of the meetings like this in
19 regards to having an environmental impact
20 statement made for Pantex and it took several
21 citizens to sue them, Mason Hangar, to get an
22 environmental impact statement made. I know in
23 that area, in hearing people from that area that
24 around Pantex the nuclear waste has polluted the
25 ground water and there is higher rates of cancer

1 in that area. Being here, maybe you guys will not
2 get that nuclear waste, but somebody is going to.
3 It is those people in Pantex where bombs are made
4 and stored. Those bombs will have to be
5 dismantled. That waste has to go somewhere.
6 Nobody wants it.

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

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

25 Well, get it turned around. Start

1 making things that make people's lives better.
2 Improve the quality of life and quit worrying
3 about the quantity of human beings. Improve our
4 quality of life. Make solar energy. Make wind
5 panels. Wind generators. There are things that
6 we can do. The technology is here. Quit making
7 more weapons of mass destruction. Thank you.

8 MR. SALAZAR: Next we have David Mason.

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

19 This is the first time that I have had
20 in my whole life to speak before any type of
21 commission of this sort and so I do appreciate
22 your opening this opportunity to us. And I
23 realize that this facility is intended to produce
24 the non-nuclear components, but still that, as
25 others have said, it contributes to the whole. It

1 is a great temptation to look at the good aspects
2 of the proposal. The infusion of money into this
3 community. The jobs. The boost to the economy.
4 And say whoopie, let's go. But that is a
5 temptation. And there are other things that could
6 be done with that same amount -- well, that money
7 that is going to be expended here and throughout
8 the country for this purpose is so huge that it
9 could do a whole lot of good.

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

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

25 From the religious perspective that I am

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

7 This seems to hold up what the true
8 nature of a Christian nation might be. "Above all
9 else, strive to be faithful to Christ's vision of
10 a peaceable kingdom of God on earth. Courageously
11 challenge cultural and political and religious
12 trends that are contrary to reconciling and
13 restoring purposes of God. Pursue peace. There
14 are subtle, yet powerful influences in the world,
15 some of them even claiming to represent Christ,
16 that seek to divide people and nations to
17 accomplish their destructive aims. That which
18 seeks to harden one human heart against another by
19 constructing walls of fear and prejudice is not of
20 God. Be especially alert to these influences lest
21 they divide you or divert you from the mission
22 which you are called. God, the eternity creator,
23 weeps for the poor, the displaced, the mistreated,
24 the diseased of the world because of their
25 unnecessary suffering. Such conditions are not

1 God's will. Open your ears to hear the pleading
2 of mothers and fathers in all nations who
3 desperately seek a future of hope for their
4 children. Do not turn away from them, for in
5 their welfare resides your welfare. The earth
6 lovingly created as an environment for life to
7 flourish, shudders in distress, because of
8 creations naturally and living systems are
9 becoming exhausted from carrying the burden of
10 human greed and conflict."

11 Now, I assume that you are all good
12 people and some of you perhaps even Christian
13 people. I have always tried in my life to avoid
14 those endeavors and I think I did so as a teacher.
15 That would cause me to be in support of those
16 things that we do not uphold as people of moral
17 courage or people of moral character. And I would
18 suggest that you look inside yourselves to that
19 occupation that you now have and see if that meets
20 with your own moral and ethical views. If
21 necessary, then to repent from those and change.
22 Repentance means change. It doesn't mean that you
23 are creating some great sin, but think about what
24 you are doing and if that's where you really want
25 to be going. Because this all has an effect upon

1 us.

2 If I might conclude, when are we going
3 to beat our swords into plowshares? When are we
4 going to realize Isaiah's vision? For many of us,
5 we want it to be now. This country is maybe one
6 of the few in the world that can do this. And we
7 can defend ourselves without the nuclear threat.
8 Thank you.

9 MR. SALAZAR: Next we have John Burriss.

10 MR. BURRIS: Good evening. My name is
11 John Burriss. I was born in Kansas City, Kansas in
12 1936. I am here because, first, I am a citizen of
13 the world. Secondly, I am an Agnostic, so you
14 will hear from the other side. And thirdly,
15 because I am a great grandfather.

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

21 Because in 1955, some 52 years ago, I
22 was at Camp Desert Rock at Yucca Flat, Nevada, in
23 the trenches with the First Marines Atomic
24 Brigade. So I had a little up close and personal
25 relationship with the nuclear bomb. Bearing in

1 mind that was a baby bomb. But what it did to the
2 little equipment those brave and smart Marines set
3 up out there was unbelievable to me. Because I
4 was like 19 years old. When you are 19 you got a
5 lot to learn if you live long enough to do that.
6 And it saddens me when I watch the Leher Report,
7 A.K.A. ADM propoganda, when I see the list of the
8 young men and women who have given their lives.

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

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

25 But one of the things that I omitted to

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

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

24 I have heard at least two references to
25 Eisenhower, talking about the military industrial

1 complex. I would like to add a couple more, which
2 would be the academic and the religious complex.
3 I think that America needs to take a real serious
4 look at itself. When we talk about terrorism, we
5 invented terrorism as far as I'm concerned. We
6 practiced genocide against part of our people, the
7 Native Americans. And we certainly practiced
8 slavery and practiced at it against the other
9 part, my African people. So I don't have any
10 illusions or delusions about what this country is
11 all about. You talk about morality. I think the
12 word would be amoral, because that's what we do.
13 So I am glad that you are here tonight. It is
14 really refreshing.

15 I see a couple faces that I have seen
16 down on 47th and down at the Nichols Plaza. And I
17 think it is really great. Because we really need
18 an awakening. Like I said, I really don't fault
19 the folks who say, "Well, this is my job," because
20 what we need to do, we don't need to take a look
21 at Bush or Rove or Wolfowitz. He is gone. Or
22 Rice or any of these other folks, because it
23 starts with us. Our commitment to our comfort
24 zone and our way of life is what keeps us in deep
25 trouble.

1 How much are we really willing to
2 sacrifice? I think this can be a start. Again I
3 am inspired to see so many folk here. And I think
4 it is going to penetrate the little brains of some
5 of the folk that say, "Well, hey, I have got to
6 make a living. Because those folks over there in
7 Iraq and Afghanistan and now Lebanon all over
8 again, are catching hell and we are the cause of
9 it. You can't shift that weight. We all have an
10 investment in this investment. I would like to
11 thank you for your patience.

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

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

20 Some of my thoughts were, I go back to
21 John Kennedy. In November of '63, November 8th of
22 '63, three weeks before he was murdered, he signed
23 an executive order to remove the troops from
24 Vietnam. He made a speech where he referred to
25 our, that we all inhabit this small planet, we all

1 breathe the same air, we all cherish our
2 children's future, we are all mortal. He did in
3 that speech a unilateral test ban on nuclear
4 weapons and he challenged the rest of the world
5 pending an official treaty to end that. This
6 madness. And he was dead three weeks later and
7 Johnson of course escalated the war. And he said
8 in that speech, "I am confident if we maintain the
9 peace, that we shall in due season reap the kind
10 of world we deserve, and deserve the kind of world
11 we will have." He was moving us towards peace and
12 elimination of these weapons. And we see where we
13 are now. He predicted right where we ended up
14 with this debacle in Iraq or this crime in Iraq.

15 But I have been thinking outside the
16 box. I had kind of an idea for this facility. My
17 thought is when Bush and Chaney are finished
18 murdering all the Iraqis we can move the
19 production to that former sovereign nation by
20 declaring it U.S. territory. The chance of
21 radioactive contamination then would be moot, in
22 that the region has already been contaminated by
23 our use of illegal depleted uranium weapons used
24 in our Blitzkrieg or Shock and Awe and subsequent
25 occupation and genocide. We could then claim the

1 oil for our nation and with Haliburton's help, do
2 the heavy refining there using our domestic
3 refineries to simply finish the product
4 alleviating our refining deficiencies.

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

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

20 (A short recess was taken.)

21 MR. SALAZAR: As I said, we do have this
22 meeting going on until 9:30. We have one person
23 who expressed an interest in continuing to speak,
24 so I want to allow him that opportunity. If
25 anyone else wishes to speak, please continue to

1 sign up on the sheet in the back and I will make
2 sure we also give you some of the time that we
3 have remaining.

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

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

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

24 Now, with that, I believe we had Jay.
25 You kind of scared me. You said you could go on

1 forever. I did bring the stool. We have the room
2 until 9:30. If we do get additional speakers I
3 will ask you to maybe cut yourself short to give
4 them time.

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

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

21 I did hear the one union official. That
22 was the one statement of support. And I wanted to
23 note that because, clearly, jobs are going to be
24 an issue and human beings need jobs. So it
25 becomes a matter of what is the appropriate way to

1 direct those jobs and future employment. And I
2 don't want to go off on too much of a tangent, but
3 suffice it to say that this country needs to
4 reorder its priorities and give people good
5 beneficial employment and I would like to see the
6 future Kansas City plant providing that kind of
7 employment in some kind of a meaningful way.

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

1 need of wise federal investment."

2 So a lot of the remarks tonight touched
3 on that. Now here is part. Again, this is the
4 Chairman on the subcommittee in the House for
5 Energy Appropriations. But he says, "There is a
6 need for a comprehensive nuclear defense strategy
7 to guide transformation downsizing of the
8 stockpile and nuclear weapons. And until progress
9 is made on this critical issue, there will be no
10 new facilities or a Reliable Replacement Warhead."
11 So perhaps the house appropriations subcommittee
12 has already mooted the issues at least for now
13 that we have discussed right here in this hearing.

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

22 Finally, he observes, "There is a
23 tremendous legacy of contamination from the past
24 60 years of nuclear weapons manufacturing. Now is
25 the time to make progress on cleaning up." And

1 then I will end on that cleaning up issue.
2 Because in my view, if the NNSA is allowed to
3 follow the course that it wants to follow, what it
4 is going to do is build up nuclear weapons, not
5 clean up.

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

1 past.

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

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

14 MR. HARSIN: If I could take another
15 minute. I really appreciated the lady's comments
16 who I met just now in thanking you all for your
17 qualifications, the good work you do. Government
18 is the only thing that represents all of us. You
19 and all your colleagues in this work I realize are
20 working on our behalf and prepared yourselves
21 well. Experienced to do this. In fact, I got my
22 graduate degree in public administration and
23 applied to GAO before I shifted direction. So I
24 hope there is a way somehow to say, as some people
25 are saying, without questioning people's

1 integrity, to keep doing your job professionally
2 and in addition to keep thinking of what is good
3 for the community, our nation and the world.
4 Thank you.

5 MR. SALAZAR: Next we have Joe Carr.

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

22 But I think you are very different. I
23 think that you are far worse than drug dealers.
24 Because the drugs that drug dealers sell to people
25 only harm themselves. And are designed to harm

1 themselves. Yes, they degrade communities and it
2 is harmful and it should be stopped. But your
3 weapons that you produce are made for the explicit
4 purpose to harm other people and to commit murder
5 and to commit genocide and to commit environmental
6 destruction. That will last longer than any
7 civilization in history has ever lasted. And
8 unlike drug dealers, you are not driven by poverty
9 and the need to survive. But the people in your
10 company and the people making decisions in your
11 company could easily afford to make alterations in
12 what you produce and to lose a little money if
13 necessary. But instead you are driven by
14 insatiable greed and lust for power that
15 inevitably leads to murder and genocide.

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

21 And in the same way our country says,
22 well, we're not obliged by international law and
23 international courts have no authority. But
24 Hitler said the same thing and other war criminals
25 have said the same thing. And you all can

1 continue to say these things to yourselves, oh, I
2 am not responsible, I am just doing my job. But
3 that's what they said at Nuremberg. And we all
4 see the money that you are making and we all see
5 who is responsible. And we will hold you
6 accountable for those war crimes. And in the
7 meantime, I will continue to educate my community
8 and the people around here continue to understand
9 what this, what your proposal means and what you
10 have done and what you are continuing to do and
11 will continue to educate the people of Kansas City
12 who will not stand for this. And will continue to
13 resist this, as we have continued to resist the
14 war in Iraq. And I think that this situation can
15 be a very strong mobilizing force for the activist
16 community in this town as well as anybody who
17 supports peace and environmental justice. And we
18 will continue to resist this. People have blocked
19 bulldozers before and we will continue to block
20 them and continue to resist this plant. Thank
21 you.

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

24 MR. FAUST: Ron Faust. Just a couple
25 points. You know, I just can't imagine how

1 responsible it is to build a \$18 billion facility
2 given the fact that we have increased our
3 indebtedness and pushing towards \$9 trillion,
4 which amounts to about \$129,000 for every person
5 born in America. How in the world can we even be
6 thinking of this allotment of money? I know the
7 Federal Reserve can just make more money, but at
8 some point this credit card mentality has got to
9 be reined in and be made some sense out of. And
10 then when we start thinking about what we are
11 building, you know, what is the purpose of it?
12 Does it have any redeeming constructive qualities?
13 It seems to me to be based out of fear.

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

1 you.

2 MR. SALAZAR: Please come up.

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

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

23 The questions, as I said earlier, define
24 what you are expected to come up with answers to.
25 I certainly encourage you in doing this to look at

1 the larger issues beyond just the immediate impact
2 of this particular plant, this particular
3 facility, this particular project. To look at the
4 bigger picture of how this relates to other
5 projects. As speakers have said this evening, how
6 this relates to the world. It is saddening that
7 we end up in this compartmentalizing to get to the
8 point where we are just pushing a button or just
9 signing a paper and deluding ourselves into
10 thinking that we are not therefore responsible for
11 what that button did.

12 The steps that it takes to get to the
13 point of doing a Holocaust sort of experience are
14 those steps. You depersonalize the other. You
15 make it so that you and another person are two
16 distinct groups. You make that person's group to
17 be less important, less valuable than yourselves.
18 You make it so that you are only following
19 somebody else's decisions, somebody else's orders,
20 somebody else's instructions. All I am doing is
21 this one little thing. And before you know it,
22 you have found yourself to be inhuman. So I pray
23 and hope that in doing these studies that you are
24 doing, that you are looking at, as much as
25 possible, these larger questions. The questions

1 MS. DELAMARET: Is it okay? I didn't
2 sign anything.

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

5 MS. DELAMARET: I will make it quick.

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

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

20 I guess also, what I really wanted to
21 say more than that, is that perhaps you can
22 understand our concerns about what is going on
23 here. You can turn on the T.V. and listen to
24 candidates who sing songs about bombing other
25 countries. And that's not just one political

1 party. The other party refuses to say that
2 certain things are off the table. And we all know
3 what that means. And they are running on it. Our
4 front runners are running on the threat.

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

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

20 MS. DELAMARET: It is Patriska
21 DeLamaret.

22 MS. FOGELSONG: Hi. My name is Karen
23 Fogelsong. And I found out about this kind of at
24 the very last minute through a forward from the
25 PeaceWorks. It is actually my first time kind of

1 attending something like this. I have been a
2 volunteer and I have been a participant speaking
3 out, but never kind of been to something like
4 this. So bear with me on being a little bit
5 green.

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

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

21 Two of them, one station had a teacher
22 that had committed a crime, was what they were
23 attending to this evening, and a public worker in
24 Oak Grove that was fired for something. I feel
25 that this deems a little bit more getting some

1 information out so people are aware of just what
2 is going on. I think there is probably a lot of
3 people that don't even know what this facility has
4 done for years up until now. I would like to see
5 and know how another hearing can be made.

6 And you have already set some time lines
7 down, it seems very well in order during the
8 presentation that you spoke as if the facility is
9 ready for planning actions for deployment as if
10 this has already gone through. I think there are
11 a lot of people who would be unhappy about this.
12 I think there are a lot of people in this city
13 that aren't aware of what is going on. I am
14 interested in how a person as green as me is able
15 to get some information, some answers, and how you
16 provide getting some answers out that are not
17 biased and how maybe there could be another event
18 where the media is there. Or someone from The
19 Star. Because from what I understand, the bit of
20 information that was out about this announcement
21 was in small print somewhere in the newspaper. If
22 we can cover all the other murders that are going
23 on around this city, then certainly we can cover
24 getting some information out about this. So how
25 would we get answers?

1 MR. SALAZAR: We do have one other
2 speaker. We have kind of six or seven minutes
3 left. We are providing a draft environmental
4 assessment. We are kind of at the beginning of
5 our process. We will make that available to the
6 public.

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

18 SPEAKER: My thoughts are not yet fully
19 formed, but I think of the word of "empire". And
20 there is a lot of books that have come out about
21 the United States as the empire. And when I look
22 at the organizations that I hear that are
23 represented, the Pentagon, the Department of
24 Energy, the National Nuclear Security Information,
25 the Department of Military, the General Services

1 Administration, you are, and I think you all know,
2 you are part of this empire that wants to control
3 the world. And the way we control the world was
4 the way -- the empire wants to control the world
5 is, you know, we're going to build nuclear weapons
6 whether the Americans want them or not. And I am
7 just appalled at the hubris, the arrogance of what
8 your organizations stand for. It has nothing to
9 do about democracy. It has to do about
10 capitalism, globalization, empire building. And
11 that's what you are all about.

12 And I don't mean to make judgments, but
13 I am just wondering how you go to bed at night.
14 And how do you think about -- I mean, as parents,
15 are you not thinking about your children? Are you
16 not thinking about your grandchildren? What are
17 you thinking about? Are you in touch with
18 reality? I don't know what else to say. I am
19 just -- I am deeply hurt by this process, because
20 I feel like we are David fighting Goliath. And I
21 still have the hope that as David, the truth, our
22 truth can stand up against the falsehood of your
23 empire that is hopefully going to crumble so that
24 the rest of the human community can live in peace
25 and with dignity. Thank you.

1 MR. SALAZAR: It looks like we are
2 almost right at the end here. I do want to make
3 aware that this ends at 9:30. So if you do need
4 to use the restroom or anything on the way out, we
5 are going to keep the building open for a few
6 minutes. Please do so at this time. We have
7 maybe three minutes or so left. If there is
8 anyone else who wants to go. As I see people
9 walking out, I just want to thank you very much
10 for your participation and attendance here. It is
11 very beneficial to hear all your public comments.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

- - - - -

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, JAMES A. LEACOCK, Certified Court Reporter,
do hereby certify that I appeared at the time and place
hereinbefore set forth; I took down in shorthand the
entire proceedings had at said time and place, and the
foregoing 97 pages constitute a true, correct and
complete transcript of my said shorthand notes.

Certified to this 7th day of June, 2007.

James A. Leacock, CCR.
Certified Court Reporter No. 662 (G)
Notary Public, State of Missouri