Hi. I would like for this call to remain anonymous but I am calling to say that I do not wish for the facility to be located in Manhattan, Kansas. I am a concerned mother of children and I am concerned with security of not only our youth but agriculture in the area.

Thank you.

Anonymous PD0172, Anonymous PD0172
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Yes, I was calling to leave a comment concerning the bio lab that you are considering developing on the mainland of the United States. I think it should be left on Plum Island because it is too dangerous to have it where there are a lot of people, a lot of livestock because people are not infallible, they can make mistakes. No building is indestructible. So please leave the bio lab off the mainland of the United States.

A very concerned United States American Citizen.

Thank you very much.
PD0181
August 22, 2008

Yes, I am a resident of Riley County, Kansas, and would like to voice my opposition to the NBAF facility coming to the campus of Kansas State University. I don’t believe the facilities should remain on or be placed on the mainland anywhere in the United States. It needs to remain off-shore. The risk to a retirement community and all the students at Kansas State and the entire community of Manhattan is too high.

Please do not place the facility in Manhattan, Kansas.

Thank you.

DHS notes the commentor’s opposition to the Manhattan Campus Site Alternative.

DHS notes the commentor’s opposition to the five mainland site alternatives. Section 3.14 and Appendix E of the NBAF EIS evaluate the potential effects on health and safety of operating the NBAF at the six site alternatives. The evaluation concludes that a pathogen release at the Plum Island Site would be slightly less likely to result in adverse effects than the mainland sites.
August 22, 2008

Yes. This is a private citizen/taxpayer living in Topeka, Kansas. And I just strongly feel that locating this bio lab at Manhattan Kansas is a very, very bad idea for our cattle industry throughout, not only our state, but just the United States period. I think keeping this off-shore is by far the best idea.

Thank you for allowing me to comment in the negative. Thank you.

Comment No: 1  Issue Code: 25.4
DHS notes the commentor's opposition to the Manhattan Campus Site Alternative in favor of the Plum Island Site Alternative based on risks to livestock. The NBAF would be designed and constructed using modern biocontainment technologies, and operated by trained staff and security personnel to ensure the maximum level of worker and public safety and least risk to the environment in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

Comment No: 2  Issue Code: 5.0
Please see response to Comment No. 1.
August 22, 2008

I support NBAF in Kansas.
Thanks.

Anonymous PD0188, Anonymous PD0188
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Comment No: 1                     Issue Code: 24.4
DHS notes the commentor's support for the Manhattan Campus Site Alternative.
I would like to say that I’m opposed to this NBAF being located in Manhattan, Kansas. I live in Manhattan and I just… I don’t think we need it here. I think the danger is too great. I’m not willing to risk my health or safety or that of my children and grandchildren who live here. I would think a lot better choice could possibly be Plum Island, in New York. I’m definitely opposed to it being located in Manhattan, Kansas.

Thank you very much.

Anonymous PD0189, Anonymous PD0189
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Comment No: 1 Issue Code: 25.4
DHS notes the commentor's opposition to the Manhattan Campus Site Alternative.

Comment No: 2 Issue Code: 19.4
DHS notes the commentor's concern regarding the siting, construction and operation of the NBAF at the proposed Manhattan, Kansas site. Section 3.14 investigates the chances of a variety of accidents that could occur with the proposed NBAF and consequences of potential accidents. Accidents could occur in the form of procedural violations (operational accidents), natural phenomena accidents, external events, and intentional acts. Although some accidents are more likely to occur than others (e.g., safety protocol not being followed), the chances of an accidental release are low. The specific objective of the hazard identification, accident analysis, and risk assessment is to identify the likelihood and consequences from accidents or intentional subversive acts. In addition to identifying the potential for or likelihood of the scenarios leading to adverse consequences, this analysis provides support for the identification of specific engineering and administrative controls to either prevent a pathogen release or mitigate the consequences of such a release. The risk of an accidental release of a pathogen is extremely low.

Comment No: 3 Issue Code: 24.1
DHS notes the commentor's opposition to the Manhattan Campus Site Alternative in favor of the Plum Island Site Alternative based on safety concerns. DHS believes that experience shows that facilities utilizing modern biocontainment technologies and safety protocols, such as would be employed in the design, construction, and operation of the NBAF, would enable the NBAF to be safely operated in populated areas. An example is the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention located in downtown Atlanta, Georgia.
Anonymous PD0190, Anonymous PD0190
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August 22, 2008

I support NBAF in Kansas.

DHS notes the commentor's support for the Manhattan Campus Site Alternative.
Anonymous PD0193, Anonymous PD0193

I support NBAF in Kansas. Our research in Kansas will enable the success of this NBAF initiative.

Thank you.

August 22, 2008

DHS notes the commentor's support for the Manhattan Campus Site Alternative.
August 22, 2008

I do not want your NBAF known in my city. I’m calling from Manhattan. Please, don’t put us all in danger here. I am strictly against for it to come here.

Thank you.
Yes. I'm a resident of Prairie Village in Kansas and I work in Topeka, Kansas and I support the NBAF in Kansas.

Thank you.
August 22, 2008

I support NBAF in Kansas.

DHS notes the commentor's support for the Manhattan Campus Site Alternative.
DHS notes the commentor's opposition to the NBAF.
I support NBAF in Kansas.

DHS notes the commentor’s support for the Manhattan Campus Site Alternative.
August 22, 2008

We vote no. We're against the BFFI. And we hope it doesn't develop in Manhattan, Kansas. We live on a farm and have livestock. So we request no.

Thank you very much. Goodbye.

Anonymous PD0208, Anonymous PD0208
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Comment No: 1  Issue Code: 25.4
DHS notes the commentor’s opposition to the Manhattan Campus Site Alternative in favor of the Plum Island Site Alternative based on risks to livestock. The NBAF would be designed and constructed using modern biocontainment technologies, and operated by trained staff and security personnel to ensure the maximum level of worker and public safety and least risk to the environment in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.
Comment No: 1 Issue Code: 25.4
DHS notes the commentor's opposition to the Manhattan Campus Site Alternative.

Comment No: 2 Issue Code: 5.0
DHS notes the commentor's opposition to siting NBAF in the U.S. heartland. The NBAF would be designed and constructed using modern biocontainment technologies, and operated by trained staff and security personnel to ensure the maximum level of worker and public safety and least risk to the environment in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

August 22, 2008

I live in Kansas and I am firmly against having this facility here or for that matter, anywhere in the heartland of this country. I think there's too much unknown about this. I think it's very dangerous.

Thank you.
Anonymous PD0210, Anonymous PD0210

August 22, 2008

I support NBAF in Kansas.

Comment No: 1                     Issue Code: 24.4
DHS notes the commentor's support for the Manhattan Campus Site Alternative.
Anonymous PD0212, Anonymous PD0212
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August 22, 2008

Thank you for the opportunity to reply to this question. I would not be in favor of this laboratory being allowed on the mainland in the United States. I feel like we would be safer to continue it where it is currently being placed rather than any of the proposed places.

I know they do great work but I would be a little uneasy, quite uneasy in fact, about having that where it could cause so much trouble for people and for animals as well.

Thanks again for the opportunity to speak.

Comment No: 1                     Issue Code: 5.0
DHS notes the commentor's opposition to the five mainland site alternatives, in particular, the Manhattan Campus Site Alternative in favor of the Plum Island Site Alternative based on safety concerns. DHS believes that experience shows that facilities utilizing modern biocontainment technologies and safety protocols, such as would be employed in the design, construction, and operation of the NBAF, would enable the NBAF to be safely operated in populated areas such as Manhattan. An example is the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention located in downtown Atlanta, Georgia.

Comment No: 2                     Issue Code: 24.1
DHS notes the commentor's support for the Plum Island Site Alternative based on safety concerns.
Anonymous PD0216, Anonymous PD0216
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Hello. I’m calling to comment on the idea of moving any kind of deathly, germ research from Plum Island to the mainland. I’m specifically calling from the Manhattan area. And I want you to know that we are very, very concerned in Manhattan about the potential of these germs getting out and destroying the economy and the people of the area.

This is not a minor concern, it’s a major one. There has been a lot of railroading in Kansas by State officials of all kinds, at all levels, trying to cull people from speaking out against the moving of NBAF to the mainland, including to the Manhattan area. In actuality there is very, very little support for having that deadly research lab here in town and in the Kansas area. Many, many people are afraid of it. Many people are afraid of any kind of environmental devastation, any further environmental devastation of Kansas and of the mainland and of the businesses that develop here.

People have been forced to sign letters and documents saying that they approve of Manhattan getting the facility. They’ve basically had their arms twisted by public officials and university officials, even in fact they do not support it. They felt like they needed to do it to keep their job or not to be oppressed at their job because they actually oppose the idea. This is a very, very deadly situation. And the people of Kansas are very much like other free thinkers in the United States. They know what would benefit them and what would not. They know what would benefit the country and what would not.

And by far, the majority of the people here in this area do not feel that it would be an economic boom, do not feel it would be helpful…feel that it would hurt the farm economy and the environment.

So, I urge you not to move the germ production facility from Plum Island to the mainland. And I hope that you will listen to the people who have their concerns all around the country not just an individual site where you’re proposing to move this deadly facility. But many, many people really believe that if you’re gonna do this kind of research, which is questionable anyway, it should be done on an island that’s off the mainland that’s being protected anyway the environment there and the oceans are not going to be affected. This is very scary stuff that you are proposing and imposing on us. And it’s very scary when the governmental officials of the State of Kansas get so excited about the idea of making a few bucks that they’re willing to sacrifice the health of the people in the area.

So our motto here in town is not Deadly Germs R Us. Our motto in Kansas is Not Deadly Germs R Us. We do not want this facility to be on the mainland.

Thank you.
to encourage public input on matters of national and international importance.

Comment No: 4                     Issue Code: 24.1
DHS notes the commentor's opposition to the five mainland site alternatives, in particular, the Manhattan Campus Site Alternative in favor of the Plum Island Site Alternative. The NBAF would be designed and constructed using modern biocontainment technologies, and operated by trained staff and security personnel to ensure the maximum level of worker and public safety and least risk to the environment in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local laws and regulations.

Comment No: 5                     Issue Code: 5.0
DHS notes the commentor's opposition to the five mainland site alternatives, in particular, the Manhattan Campus Site Alternative in favor of the Plum Island Site Alternative based on safety concerns. DHS believes that experience shows that facilities utilizing modern biocontainment technologies and safety protocols, such as would be employed in the design, construction, and operation of the NBAF, would enable the NBAF to be safely operated in populated areas such as Manhattan. An example is the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention located in downtown Atlanta, Georgia.
August 22, 2008

I would prefer not having the National Bio Agro Defense Facility on our U.S. mainland.

I thank you very much.

DHS notes the commentor's opposition to the five mainland site alternatives.
Hi. I was calling to let y’all know that I live in Madison County and would be more than happy and feel honored and privileged to be a part of protecting our Nation’s security against bioterrorism. And am all for having the facility, the National Bio and Agro Defense Facility, in Mississippi.

I think it’s extremely important that we continue the research and development of this particular area. I do believe this facility is safe and secure. It does not frighten me or any one I’ve spoken with whatsoever and, in fact, it would bring so many more new jobs to the area that are needed.

And especially in the Madison County area we have wonderful education. This gives a great opportunity for those educational facilities to utilize whatever may be there or influence them in maybe choosing a career, a future. I just think it’s a wonderful opportunity. And it will help bring brighter young people and employees to the area which can do nothing but improve what we already have which are already great resources.

So I certainly encourage this organization to please seriously consider Mississippi as the location.

I appreciate your time.

Thank you.
I'm a resident north of Manhattan about 30 miles. And I'm in a farming community that has a lot of cattle. And we would like to encourage you to put your research thing on foot and mouth disease that you're planning on putting in Manhattan, Kansas – I really feel it should be put on an island somewhere. I don’t know if Plum Island is right or not, but please don’t put it here. We would…really wish you would put it somewhere else.

Thanks a lot.

Good bye.
Hello. I live in Flora, Madison County, Jackson area of Mississippi. I am providing you a comment. I would like to say that I am not in favor of the bio chemical plant to be housed there in Flora, Mississippi. I feel like that it is not of the interest of the citizens of Flora, Mississippi. And that it would not bring any increase in jobs nor would it bring the increase in housing there. No one in Flora would be able to have the high paying jobs such as chemist, biologist or scientist. I feel like that most of the jobs will be janitorial work, construction work. Therefore the construction work would only last while the plant is being built. After the plant is being built there will no longer be any need for the construction work.

I just feel like this is not a good move for the citizens of Flora.

Thank you.

Bye.

DHS notes the commentor's opposition to the Flora Industrial Park Site Alternative.

DHS notes the commentor's statement regarding employment. In addition to creating temporary construction jobs, the proposed action is expected to directly and indirectly support permanent jobs. A portion of the permanent jobs at the NBAF will be filled by the local labor force and the household spending by new residents and the operations of the NBAF are expected to indirectly support additional jobs that will be filled by the local labor force. The number of short-term and permanent jobs that would be directly and indirectly created by the construction and operations of the NBAF at the Flora Industrial Park Site are discussed in Chapter 3 of Section 3.10.5 of the NBAF EIS.

DHS notes the commentor's statement regarding housing. Section 3.10.5.3 of the NBAF EIS concludes that the overall effect of NBAF on housing market conditions would be negligible. It is expected that the housing market would be able to meet the relatively small increase in housing demand generated by NBAF employees relocating to the area.
Hi. I am a lifelong resident of Madison County, Mississippi. I am greatly opposed to building the Agro Defense Lab in Flora, Mississippi. I believe that it poses health risks or possible health risks associated with any accidents that could happen at the facility—health risks that could affect the livestock in the area and impacting business in the area.

Thank you for your time.

Anonymous PD0226, Anonymous PD0226
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DHS notes the commentor's opposition to the Flora Industrial Park Site Alternative.

DHS notes the commentor's concern regarding the potential health risks posed by a NBAF accident. Section 3.14 investigates the chances of a variety of accidents that could occur with the proposed NBAF and consequences of potential accidents. Accidents could occur in the form of procedural violations (operational accidents), natural phenomena accidents, external events, and intentional acts. Although some accidents are more likely to occur than others (e.g., safety protocol not being followed), the chances of an accidental release are low. The specific objective of the hazard identification, accident analysis, and risk assessment is to identify the likelihood and consequences from accidents or intentional subversive acts. In addition to identifying the potential for or likelihood of the scenarios leading to adverse consequences, this analysis provides support for the identification of specific engineering and administrative controls to either prevent a pathogen release or mitigate the consequences of such a release. The risk of an accidental release of a pathogen is extremely low.

DHS notes the commentor's concern about potential impacts to local business from an accident. The risk of an accidental release of a pathogen is extremely low, but DHS acknowledges that the possible economic effect would be significant for all sites. Section 3.10.9 of the NBAF EIS presents estimates of the possible economic effect of an accidental release.
I’m calling in regards to the lab that would be built at Manhattan. And we are against it because we do not want these deadly germs in Kansas. We believe that they still belong where they are now. And that that is the best place for this building to be at—on Plum Island. And there’s just too much chance of human error and it would contaminate our State. First of all, life is too precious and second it would be a big monetary loss to our State.

Thank you very much.
I am against the NBAF in Manhattan, Kansas. I do not want it in my town.

Thank you.