

Murray said Rollins was a very dynamic individual that got things started. He said he helped fund a variety of development initiatives such as the Jersey Creek Project, the Jack Reardon Civic Center, the Hilton Garden Inn/BFU Office Complex and the most recent, the Weed and Seed program, which helps weed out criminal elements in the community. "He started the Human Engineering Committee for Kansas and Missouri, which focused on getting the Weed and Seed program going," Murray said. "The program helped produce positive individuals and communities."

Murray said Rollins was proud of his accomplishment of securing grants to demolish drug houses. He said those areas are more secure because the drug houses have been cleared. "When you look at the areas in the community that are yet redeveloped, at least a number of those areas are more secure because the dilapidated structures are torn down."

Murray said that oftentimes Rollins came across as a commoner. He said while he gave this appearance he was able to effectively communicate across all lines, including those of senators, representatives and the common man.

Andy said it's hard to believe his father is gone. He said it's hard to say how his father's life will affect people in the future but he knows he will be remembered.

Edward said his father helped countless amounts of people. He reached out to urban areas, helped black people get involved and showed them how to become active in their community. "God put him on this earth to do something with Wyandotte County," Edward said. "He made Wyandotte County a positive place to live and raise kids."

**ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2005**

SPEECH OF

**HON. DAVID WU**

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, April 21, 2005*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6) to ensure jobs for our future with secure, affordable, and reliable energy:

Mr. WU. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support to the Castle-Markey amendment to H.R. 6, the Energy Policy Act of 2005.

This amendment would ensure that States have control over whether an LNG facility is sited in their district. Under the energy bill, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) would have the sole authority to make decisions regarding the construction, expansion and operation of LNG facilities. While the bill requires FERC to consult with State and local governments, they have no role in the final decision, and FERC is not required to consider their concerns.

This is unconscionable. It is exactly the local communities who must have the final say in whether or not an LNG facility is built in their district. It is these people who must live with the decision either way. The Castle amendment would create authority for States to have a say in the final decision.

Currently, I have four proposed LNG sites in my district, and I have heard from many of my constituents about these proposals, both

against the sites because of environmental concerns and because of job creation. It is exactly these individuals who should get to decide if an LNG plant will be sited in their community; it should not be a decision made by a Washington, DC based government official who has no connection to the site.

This amendment would enhance the process of selection and provide the community an outlet to be more involved. It is my hope that the local communities, State, and FERC can work together in deciding whether or not a LNG facility is good for Oregon.

I am a strong believer in participation of all stakeholders when it comes to monumental decisions like these. I support transparency among the local, State, and federal governments to ensure the process is thorough and thoughtful.

I strongly believe that the States should have authority in LNG facility sites and I urge my colleagues to vote for the Castle-Markey amendment.

**U.S. POLICY OPTIONS FOR IRAN**

**HON. BOB FILNER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, April 27, 2005*

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, today I enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a report by the Iran Policy Committee (IPC) entitled, "U.S. Policy Options for Iran." The IPC found that Iran presents a growing challenge to U.S. interests and values in a number of areas. The report examines the U.S. policy options for addressing these concerns and calls for change in Iran based on internal Iranian opposition.

We need to foster greater awareness and dialogue in Congress about this critical situation. To that end, I urge my colleagues to review this report and join me developing an effective U.S. policy on Iran.

**U.S. POLICY OPTIONS FOR IRAN**

PREPARED BY: IRAN POLICY COMMITTEE (IPC)

CO-CHAIRS

Ambassador James Akins, (ret.)

Lt. Col. Bill Cowan, USMC (ret.), CEO, wvc3, inc.

Paul Leventhal, Founder and President Emeritus, Nuclear Control Institute

Dr. Neil Livingstone, CEO, Global Options, Inc.

Bruce McColm, President, Institute for Democratic Strategies and Former President, International Republican Institute

Lt. General (ret.) Thomas McInerney Former Assistant Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force

Captain Chuck Nash (ret.) President, Emerging Technologies International

Lt. General Edward Rowny (ret.) Former Ambassador Strategic Arms Reduction Talks Professor Raymond Tanter Former Staff Member, National Security Council

Major General (ret.) Paul Valley, Military Committee Chairman, Center for Security Policy

Executive Director: Clare Lopez Strategic Policy and Intelligence Analyst

**U.S. POLICY OPTIONS FOR IRAN: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Iran poses six threats to American interests and ideals:

Drive to acquire nuclear weapons.

Continuing support for and involvement with terrorist networks.

Aid to groups working against the Arab-Israeli peace process.

Disruptive role in Iraq.

Expansionist radical ideology.

Denial of basic human rights to its own population.

With respect to these threats from Iran, Washington circles largely divide between two alternatives—those who favor engagement with and those who support military strikes against the regime. Few favor regime change as an end in itself.

While the Bush administration does not yet explicitly call for changing the regime, it advocates working with the Iranian people as opposed to the unelected theocracy in Tehran, which is an implicit policy of regime change.

By calling for change in Tehran based on the Iranian opposition instead of the U.S. military, the Iran Policy Committee (IPC) highlights a third alternative: Keep open diplomatic and military options, while providing a central role for the Iranian opposition to facilitate regime change.

IPC joins the debate in Washington over Iran policy initiated by think tank reports on Iran—Council on Foreign Relations (CFR), The Committee on the Present Danger (CPD), and The Washington Institute for Near East Policy (TWI). In contrast to the thrust of such reports, IPC suggests that Iranian opposition groups ought to play a central role in U.S. policymaking regarding Iran.

Comprised of former officials who have worked on the Middle East in the White House, State Department, Pentagon, intelligence agencies, Congress, and experts from think tanks and universities, IPC welcomes the occasion to support the Iranian people in pursuit of U.S. national interests. But continued designation since 1997 of the main Iranian opposition group, Mujahedeen e-Khalq (MEK), as a foreign terrorist organization by the State Department assures Tehran that regime change is off the table. Removing the MEK's terrorist designation would be a tangible signal to Tehran and to the Iranian people that a new option is implicitly on the table—regime change.

**U.S. POLICY OPTIONS FOR IRAN**

INTRODUCTION

" . . . liberty in our land depends on the success of liberty in other lands . . . . So it is the policy of the United States to seek and support the growth of democratic movements and institutions in every nation and culture.—President George W. Bush, Inaugural Address, 20 January 2005.

"As you stand for liberty, America stands with you."—President George W. Bush, State of the Union Address, 2 February 2005.

Using the theme of liberty in general from his Inaugural Address, President Bush refers directly to the Iranian people in his State of the Union Address. In so doing, he tacitly "targets" the regime in Tehran.

The question is what means should the President use to decrease threats posed by Iran:

Continued negotiations, including positive and negative incentives.

Future military action.

Support for the Iranian opposition.

These options are neither mutually exclusive nor logically exhaustive; but they do reflect courses of action being considered in Washington.

Because the Iranian regime's policies pose direct threats to national security interests