

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

PUBLIC HEARING
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE
DISPOSAL OF GREATER-THAN-CLASS C (GCC)
LOW-LEVEL RADIOACTIVE WASTE AND GCC-LIKE WASTE

- - - - -

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PUBLIC HEARING

Before Jeri L. Chandler, CCR, RPR, RMR

At the Red Lion Inn

2525 North 20th Avenue, Pasco, Washington

On May 17, 2011, Commencing at 6:30 p.m.

- - - - -

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

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

Hosting Public Hearing For the Department of Energy:

Facilitator: Mr. Holmes Brown

- - - - -

INDEX TO PUBLIC HEARING

Page

| | |
|-------------------------------|----|
| INTRODUCTION BY MR. BROWN | 3 |
| PUBLIC COMMENTS | 5 |
| CERTIFICATE OF COURT REPORTER | 27 |

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY PUBLIC HEARING
DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE
DISPOSAL OF GREATER-THAN-CLASS C (GCC) LOW-LEVEL
RADIOACTIVE WASTE AND GCC-LIKE WASTE

- - - - -

INTRODUCTION

MR. BROWN: It's now time to receive your
comments on the Draft EIS. This is your opportunity to
provide DOE with oral comments on what you would like to
see as a preferred alternative or what factors DOE should
consider in making a final determination.

A court reporter will transcribe your comments
for the administrative record. Our court reporter tonight

1 is Jeri Chandler, seated at the table over there.

2 DOE has stated how critical your input is to the
3 development of this EIS. This evening's format is
4 designed to ensure that all interested parties have equal
5 opportunity to provide input. In order to do this, let me
6 review a few ground rules for this part of the agenda.

7 Please step up to this podium right there when
8 your name is called, introduce yourself, providing an
9 organizational affiliation, where appropriate.

10 If you have a written version of your statement,
11 please provide a copy to the court reporter after you have
12 completed your remarks. Also, please give the reporter
13 any additional attachments to your statement that you'd
14 like included in the transcript. Each will be labeled and
15 submitted for inclusion in the formal record.

16 I will call two names at a time, the first of the
17 speaker, the second of the person to follow. In view of
18 the number of people who have signed up to speak tonight,
19 I'm actually not going to put a time limit on it.

20 We've had a varying number of speakers over the
21 last seven meetings. Generally, folks are able to
22 conclude their formal comments within five minutes, but I
23 prefer to have everybody complete their statements tonight
24 within the first reading. I guess what I'd say is if you
25 see the audience nodding off as you continue, that will be

1 your cue to conclude your statement. So that will be the
2 introduction.

3 And Arnie Edelman will be serving as the DOE's
4 hearing officer tonight. He will not be answering
5 questions or responding to comments, but he will be
6 keeping careful notes on each statement.

7 So, given that, by way of introduction, let me
8 call our first speaker. Sean Murphy, representing the
9 Washington State Department of Health, will be our first
10 speaker, and he will be followed by Ron Skinnarland of the
11 Department of Ecology.

12 Sean, welcome.

13 - - - - -

14 PUBLIC COMMENTS

15 MR. MURPHY: Thank you. Sean Murphy, Washington
16 State Department of Health.

17 Short message to the DOE. We hope you guys work
18 hard on this. There's licensees in the State of
19 Washington that are the caretakers of this material, and
20 it's just sitting there waiting for something to happen to
21 it. So please continue your good work on the EIS and
22 select something. Thanks.

23 MR. BROWN: That is a model of brevity. I will
24 refer to your statements. If people in Portland carry on
25 too long, I'll cite your good example.

1 Our next speaker is Ron Skinnarland.

2 MR. SKINNARLAND: Yes. I want to thank you all
3 for coming tonight. I'm Ron Skinnarland. I work for the
4 Washington State Department of Ecology, here in the
5 Richland office. And the State of Washington is concerned
6 that there be a safe place to put Greater-Than-Class C
7 waste.

8 I have a letter I'd like to read tonight. It's a
9 joint letter from the head of the Department of Ecology
10 and the head of the Oregon Department of Environmental
11 Quality and I think summarizes our concerns about the
12 potential impact of bringing off-site waste to Hanford for
13 disposal.

14 So, basically, the letter is addressed to
15 Mr. Edelman, and it's about the Greater-Than-Class C EIS.
16 It starts -- I'll just read it.

17 "We are very disappointed that the
18 Draft EIS for the disposal of
19 Greater-than-Class C Waste and
20 Greater-Than-Class-C-Like Waste continues
21 to list Hanford as a viable location for
22 the disposal of these highly radioactive
23 wastes. We believe that a thorough
24 analysis would clearly demonstrate that
25 this additional burden of waste would

1 create unacceptable environmental
2 consequences.

3 "Rather than focusing on analyzing the
4 most appropriate site for disposal of these
5 wastes, the EIS appears to try to preserve
6 every potential option and alternative, to
7 the detriment of the overall process.

8 "The states of Washington and Oregon
9 adamantly oppose use of Hanford for
10 disposal of Greater-Than-Class C Waste.
11 Both of our states are deeply engaged in,
12 and supportive of, cleanup of radioactive
13 and chemically hazardous wastes at Hanford
14 for over 20 years. Adding more waste to
15 the subsurface, especially waste that is
16 highly radioactive and long-lived, is
17 incompatible with the cleanup effort that
18 has come at such a high price and that we
19 all support.

20 "Since the Hanford cleanup began in
21 1989, the federal government has spent more
22 than 30 billion taxpayer dollars to try to
23 clean up the extensive environmental injury
24 caused by 45 years of plutonium production.
25 The United States Department of Energy will

1 be cleaning up the existing contamination
2 at Hanford for many decades to come, at a
3 cost of tens of billions of additional
4 dollars.

5 "The problems US DOE faces at Hanford
6 are so daunting that no precise estimate is
7 currently available.

8 "Even when the work is complete to the
9 best of our collective ability, extensive
10 contamination will remain. The Department
11 of Energy's own analysis in the Draft
12 Hanford Tank Closure and Waste Management
13 Environmental Impact Statement shows
14 persistent contamination of Hanford
15 groundwater for thousands of years due to
16 waste now in the subsurface.

17 "So it is inconceivable to us that the
18 Department of Energy would spend billions
19 of dollars to try to clean up the
20 environmental damage at Hanford, yet ignore
21 that work by proposing to dispose of
22 additional highly radioactive wastes on the
23 site.

24 "Protection of the Columbia River is a
25 core value of the states of Washington and

1 Oregon and the people of the Pacific
2 Northwest. The consideration of Hanford as
3 a disposal site for Greater-Than-Class C
4 Waste is contrary to that value, and we
5 strongly urge that the Department of Energy
6 remove Hanford from the list of possible
7 waste sites for disposal of this waste."

8 And the letter is signed Ted Sturdevant, Director
9 of the Washington Department of Ecology, and Bob Repine,
10 the Acting Director of Oregon Department of Energy. I
11 have a copy of that.

12 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.

13 Sean's brief statement caught me by surprise. So
14 I didn't get to our speaker after Ron, but it's Jerry
15 Pollet, who I think is always ready to speak. So Jerry is
16 next, and Amy Harwood will follow Jerry.

17 MR. POLLET: Thank you. My name is Jerry Pollet,
18 P-o-l-l-e-t, representing Heart of America Northwest and
19 Heart of America Northwest Research Center, with 16,000
20 members across Washington and Oregon, and we have been
21 leading the citizen efforts to advocate for the cleanup of
22 Hanford since 1987.

23 I want to start our comments by thanking
24 Mr. Arnie Edelman for taking the step that many of us in
25 the -- on the Hanford Advisory Board and public community

1 working for improving public notices for DOE headquarter's
2 Environmental Impact Statements when he used the existing
3 site lists and the lists from the prior related
4 Environmental Impact Statement to put out notice for this
5 hearing and the Portland hearing on Thursday night.

6 For several years, the advisory board and citizen
7 groups have urged that when DOE headquarters does a NEPA
8 EIS instead of the site, it should use the site's cleanup
9 lists because the public believes that, when they sign up
10 on one list with the Department of Energy, they will get
11 all notices about all related issues and not be told that,
12 well, that EIS is in a different administrative drawer out
13 of a different office; and, therefore, you didn't get
14 notice of it. So thank you very much for doing that.
15 That was the good news.

16 MR. BROWN: Sorry. Your time is up.

17 MR. POLLET: Great. Okay. So let's start where
18 the state left off on cumulative impacts. We are very
19 disturbed at the lack of coordination between the Hanford
20 Tank Closure/Waste Management Environmental Impact
21 Statement and the Greater-Than-Class C EIS.

22 A year ago at this time, in providing the
23 Department of Energy comments on the Tank Closure and
24 Waste Management EIS, hundreds of people noted that the
25 Department had a currently pending proposal to dispose of

1 3 million cubic feet of low-level and mixed radioactive
2 chemical wastes at Hanford and another proposal in a
3 different EIS that was coming out this year to dispose of
4 highly radioactive Greater-Than-Class C and
5 Greater-Than-Class C-Like Wastes, which we just call,
6 really, radioactive waste; and that the public deserved to
7 see all of the cumulative impacts, all of the risks -- for
8 instance, all the truck route risks -- in one document and
9 comment on them at one time.

10 It will not do for the Department of Energy to
11 say, Well, we'll combine them in a final EIS, but you
12 won't ever get to see them to comment on them. No?
13 Because you didn't listen, you're going to need to come
14 back out to the public and disclose all the impacts at one
15 time.

16 Let's talk about the impacts at Hanford to the
17 groundwater and the future generations, both Native
18 Americans who have treaty rights to live along and fish
19 the Columbia River and live on the site and use the
20 groundwater and others who will be using the groundwater
21 over the next 10,000 years.

22 In the Tank Closure/Waste Management EIS, the
23 Department of Energy estimates that iodine will be --
24 radioactive iodine will be 50 times the drinking water
25 standard at the edge of the Central Plateau Core Zone,

1 essentially the same location where the
2 Greater-Than-Class C EIS says, We hypothesize that someone
3 will be using the groundwater, and that's the place where
4 we're considering what the radioactive dose will be.

5 So iodine, 50 times the drinking water standard;
6 plutonium-239, 175 times the drinking water standard;
7 chromium, 25 times the drinking water standard.

8 For these extremely radioactive wastes that the
9 Department of Energy wants to bury at the edge of the
10 200 East Area, if they use Hanford, they estimate that the
11 dose for using landfill trenches will be 48 millirem per
12 year, just from the extremely radioactive GTCC wastes in
13 tonight's impact statement. That works out to be, using
14 the "Biological Effects of Ionizing Radiation" BEIR-7
15 report from 2005, which the Department of Energy should be
16 utilizing for dose and risk estimates, but it refuses to
17 do so -- it's the National Academy of Sciences' consensus
18 report, and DOE is supposed to be using it -- works out to
19 be a childhood fatal cancer rate of 2 percent.

20 That is genocidal. If the Department of Energy
21 says it's okay to put more waste here, and we view this
22 knowing -- we do this knowing that there are treaty rights
23 to live along and use the groundwater as recognized by
24 court decisions and 2 percent of the children will die,
25 it's genocidal.

1 But wait. That's only part of the picture
2 because the so-called reference location for the GTCC
3 waste happens to be immediately adjacent to the other
4 landfill that DOE has already built and is also proposing
5 to put an additional 3 million cubic feet of radioactive
6 and radioactive chemical wastes, some of which are quite
7 radioactive and which will be highly mobile with the
8 chemicals co-disposed.

9 But wait. Immediately to the west of that site
10 upgradient is the commercial radioactive waste dump in the
11 center of Hanford, leaking unlined soil trenches; and the
12 State of Washington which operates that site estimates
13 that, under its proposed plan to just put dirt over the
14 top of it instead of removing Greater-Than-Class C and
15 remote-handle transuranics and uranium wastes and chemical
16 wastes, all of which are there in large quantities, that
17 the Department of Ecology and Department of Health
18 estimate that the groundwater dose from that burial ground
19 alone is an additional 22 millirem.

20 So if we add up just two of the landfills, we get
21 a dose of essentially 70 millirem to the child in the same
22 location.

23 And the Department of Energy is totally
24 misleading and not providing an analysis based on
25 realistic science and disclosure when it says, But there

1 are no latent cancer fatalities. The number of latent
2 cancer fatalities they present in their charts for the
3 landfill trench at Hanford is .0003. And you have to read
4 the footnote to see that that's per year. Over 10,000
5 years, actually, some people are going to die from that.

6 But then you have to say, How did they get that?
7 Oh, they ignored the fact that there are treaty rights to
8 live along; and that the Department of Energy has done
9 studies and Battelle did a study and other people have
10 done studies saying, in fact, there are likely to be
11 thousands of people using the groundwater; and, in fact,
12 any future residents will be using the groundwater because
13 withdrawing water from the Columbia River is not allowed
14 and will not be allowed, but anyone can put in a
15 groundwater well in the State of Washington, without a
16 permit, for a home and is likely to be able to do so a
17 hundred years from now.

18 And what's going to stop those people from
19 putting in those groundwater wells, drinking that water,
20 and having 2 to 4 percent of their children die? We are.
21 That's what's going to stop it because we can't let you do
22 this. You need to say, Hanford's mission is cleanup.

23 And it was unacceptable to hear tonight and in
24 reading the Notice of Intent and the Federal Register
25 Notice and the EIS that the Department of Energy says it

1 chose Hanford as one of the sites to study because one of
2 its missions is disposal.

3 Every DOE official visits Hanford and says, Your
4 mission is just cleanup; but when it's convenient for us,
5 we're adding in disposal.

6 Hanford cannot be viewed as a disposal site. The
7 mission needs to be cleanup. Nowhere in your GTCC EIS is
8 there a single mention of the fact that the cleanup
9 standard, which DOE says it is striving to meet at
10 Hanford, set by EPA, is 15 millirem dose from all sources
11 for any individual at any time in the future.

12 15 millirem from all sources. Okay? That equals
13 eight fatal cancers in every 10,000 adults, and DOE says,
14 We're going to try to meet that. That's acceptable,
15 except then the Department of Energy comes along and says,
16 Now we're going to add highly radioactive waste and put it
17 above the groundwater, and the dose will be more than
18 three times what we say we're allowing from all sources.
19 After we spend, as the state just noted, tens and tens of
20 billions of dollars cleaning up Hanford, we'll be adding
21 something that increases the dose three times above what
22 we say we're cleaning up Hanford to do.

23 Highly radioactive wastes belong in a deep
24 underground geologic repository. They do not belong in
25 near-surface landfills, boreholes or trenches or vaults.

1 In 1970, the old Atomic Energy Commission, which
2 was broken up to be the Department of Energy and Nuclear
3 Regulatory Commission, made a decision that all
4 transuranic wastes, long-lived wastes like plutonium,
5 would be disposed in a deep geologic repository. That's
6 where they belong.

7 There is a lot of that waste buried before 1970
8 sitting in Hanford soil. In fact, there is more of it
9 sitting in Hanford soil than the Department of Energy
10 plans to dispose in the WIPP repository. It needs a deep
11 geologic repository. And then we have no national deep
12 geologic repository for high-level nuclear wastes, spent
13 fuel.

14 So the logical thing for the Department of Energy
15 to be doing here, and what is required by the National
16 Environmental Policy Act, which says you must consider all
17 reasonable alternatives, is to say the most reasonable
18 alternative is that we are going to start over a national
19 search for a deep geologic repository; or, two, we will
20 look in the granite shield of North America, which the
21 National Academy and scientists have said is the preferred
22 location for keeping radioactive waste out of groundwater
23 for tens of thousands of years, and we will include both
24 the spent fuel, high-level nuclear waste, and these wastes
25 in that search for a repository.

1 That's where the waste belongs, not near the
2 surface, and that's what we urge you to do and to remove
3 Hanford from further consideration as a national
4 radioactive waste dump.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. BROWN: Thanks very much.

7 Amy Harwood, and she'll be followed by Janet
8 Johnson.

9 MS. HARWOOD: My name is Amy Harwood, and I'm
10 here representing Columbia Riverkeeper.

11 Just short comments, but I do want to share in,
12 echo Jerry's comments and say that we are opposed to
13 additional waste coming to the Hanford Site and support
14 the ongoing cleanup to continue of the existing buried
15 waste.

16 We have significant concerns about the legacy
17 that this leaves for the communities near and down river
18 from Hanford. We have concerns about the ability for the
19 Department of Energy to fulfill their obligations in the
20 tri-party agreement.

21 And I'll just say, on a side note, I've been, the
22 last couple of days, going to some high school classes and
23 talking to them about Hanford, and it's resonated to me to
24 see their reactions, some of the high school students'
25 reactions, to this issue. It's sort of shock. I think a

1 lot of them have grown up feeling like Hanford is pretty
2 important to their families, and to think that this is
3 going to get added on to this legacy, it's been
4 interesting seeing some of their reactions.

5 The Hanford Reach is well documented as the only
6 remaining -- as one of the remaining significant spawning
7 grounds for the fall-run Chinook Salmon on the main stem
8 of the Columbia.

9 And I'm sure this isn't news to anyone in this
10 room, but I find it surprising that there is such a lack
11 of information about Department of Energy's ESA
12 obligations for impact several species in the EIS, and we
13 find it unacceptable.

14 Also, the cost reasoning for not considering more
15 appropriate locations in deep geological sites is
16 definitely not reasonable. You said in the presentation
17 that the salt site costs \$2 billion, and yet the VIT plant
18 being built at Hanford is considerably more than that. So
19 I think that that actually came across as sounding like a
20 drop in the bucket.

21 And then, just on a personal note, I split my
22 time between LaGrande, Oregon, and Portland. So I travel
23 on I-84 and I-5 a lot. And I find it really discouraging
24 that it seems as though the analysis for the
25 transportation of this waste is being left up until the

1 site-specific review, and I think that that's an
2 inappropriate place for that analysis to exist.

3 I suspect that, in Portland, you'll hear from
4 people concerned about the fact that these trucks would be
5 going -- potentially going through the city, but then
6 again, we don't even know if that's the case because
7 there's very little recognition of what routes would
8 actually be used.

9 And I think it's sort of a deep irony that the
10 origin of NEPA is from highways being built through
11 neighborhoods and the impact that they would have on
12 people, and yet you have totally left that part out of
13 this EIS, which, to me, seems like something that will
14 actually impact a far greater number of people than even
15 the individual sites that you're considering.

16 I will leave the rest of my comments to be
17 submitted in paper through Columbia Riverkeeper, but
18 thanks a lot.

19 MR. BROWN: Thanks, Amy.

20 Janet Johnson is our next speaker, and Jim
21 Bruvold will be after Janet.

22 MS. JOHNSON: What I'm going to say might sound
23 kind of familiar --

24 MR. BROWN: Let me move this down a little bit.

25 MS. JOHNSON: -- because I'm just going to say,

1 from what I've been hearing, we already have a wonderful
2 place to put this stuff. It's called Yucca Mountain, and
3 it is absolutely idiocy not to put our nuclear waste
4 there.

5 And someone, maybe all of us, somehow have to get
6 through to our government, the people making the decision,
7 that this is an important decision and that it was all
8 settled.

9 And thanks to politics getting involved, suddenly
10 we need to save Yucca Mountain because it's going down the
11 drain. It's already built. It's almost ready to open.
12 It will meet all the criteria that everyone has been
13 talking about, all the criteria except that it doesn't
14 satisfy -- what's his name, the man who got it taken off
15 the record?

16 And I don't know -- I just can't understand how
17 such a thing could happen, such stupidity could be allowed
18 to remain. And then you start talking about putting it
19 here instead or all kinds of other places that are not
20 acceptable, after we've spent millions of dollars setting
21 up the perfect place to bring our nuclear waste. It's
22 sitting there. It's waiting. It's just about ready, or
23 was until they started dismantling it.

24 And this just -- America can't be stupid enough
25 to let this happen and then maybe put it in Hanford where

1 it's going to endanger people? It's just inconceivable.
2 Someone has to wake up and let our politicians know that
3 this stuff doesn't go.

4 Our president just did a great job on one thing,
5 catching the number one crime man in the world, but -- and
6 that is something good he did. This is something terrible
7 that he has done, to try to close Yucca Mountain.

8 I worked not -- I worked for about 10 years at
9 Nevada Test Site, mostly with Lawrence Livermore National
10 Lab, on testing nuclear weapons underground, which was the
11 safe way to test them. Now they aren't being tested at
12 all, which is safer yet.

13 But I did do a little bit of work on Nevada Test
14 Site for nuclear waste storage, but very little of my work
15 was involved with that. But I know how much money has
16 gone into it, how much -- how many people have worked on
17 it, how much has been planned for it, and I know that -- I
18 believe -- I think someone is going down to Oregon. You
19 know, there was a nuclear plant in Oregon briefly. Years
20 ago, I worked on that when it was under construction. It
21 was in effect for maybe two or three years and then closed
22 down, and I understand that the radia -- nuclear fuel is
23 sitting there on the ground underwater with nothing
24 around.

25 I mean, this is ridiculous. This is untenable.

1 You just can't run our country this way. Well, I guess
2 that's the main thing I wanted to say.

3 Yucca Mountain cost millions of dollars. It has
4 been well constructed. It was shut just about when they
5 were ready to say it's ready to go, you know. How stupid
6 can everyone be to let this happen?

7 That's all.

8 MR. BROWN: Fine. Thanks very much.

9 MS. JOHNSON: I'm sorry, but it's just
10 unbelievable to me. We're supposed to be smart. We're
11 not.

12 MR. BROWN: Jim Bruvold is our speaker now.

13 MR. BRUVOLD: Good evening. My name is James
14 Bruvold. I'm a consulting engineer with Sun Rays
15 Mechanical Contractors.

16 I live in Eugene, Oregon, and I've been attending
17 these meetings for the past year or so, and I've got a
18 pretty good idea of the problems that people are
19 considering here. I think I have a solution that I would
20 like to present.

21 I've been talking to some of the people at the
22 Department of Energy here about it. It's so simple, it's
23 almost stupid. There are fungus that grow on the soil
24 that are actually able to sequester and hold radioactive
25 elements in their bodies, and they use that disintegration

1 energy as a life source.

2 If we were to feed this fungus and culture it in
3 place, perhaps we could find a way of sequestering the
4 leaking waste tanks at the Central Plateau as 110 square
5 miles of contaminated surface area; and the fungus, if
6 they had all the elements they need to survive, they may
7 be able to thrive for hundreds or maybe thousands of
8 years. This may be a long-term solution.

9 So I'm preparing a proposal that I will submit,
10 but I thought I would come here tonight and make a
11 presentation and meet some of the people here, and see
12 what we can do.

13 Mark, would you like to say a few words? I knew
14 I was going to get you up here. This is my business
15 partner, Mark Ray. And as this gentleman was saying,
16 that, you know, probably the best place to put it is in a
17 deep hole in the ground that already exists.

18 And where did the uranium come from?

19 MR. RAY: Okay. I worked on the uranium mines in
20 New Mexico. I was on the uranium mines in New Mexico, in
21 the development.

22 There are two holes in New Mexico. One is at
23 Grants, New Mexico, where most of the uranium came from in
24 the first place. It is 3400 feet down. It does have a
25 water problem, but it is a hole already there.

1 There is another hole at Crown Point, New Mexico,
2 on the Navajo Reservation, that is 3400 feet that we
3 drilled in 1980 and abandoned it. It's gone. It's there.
4 Conoco -- Phillips-Conoco drilled the hole for a new mine
5 site.

6 I never believed -- I have never been back there,
7 but I don't believe they ever developed this mine site.
8 All they did is drill a 3200-foot hole, 25 feet in
9 diameter, and capped it. It's still there. It's the best
10 place to put it. That's my only thing about it.

11 If you are looking at a waste site, I agree with
12 that woman right there, Yucca Mountain was made for it.
13 They turned it down for who knows -- political reasons.
14 It's in Nevada.

15 But there are places to put this stuff, and the
16 highly radioactive material needs to be buried deep.
17 3400 feet is where this stuff all came from. And at that
18 depth, the material and the rock is now already at --
19 3 percent is the material content of the uranium in that
20 hole at 3400 feet. That's the vein of the -- that's where
21 they mined it all. So that's basically what I wanted to
22 put in.

23 Thank you.

24 MR. BROWN: Fine. Thanks very much.

25 That concludes the list of folks who signed up

1 ahead of time to speak. Let me ask if there's anyone else
2 in the audience now who would like to make a first-time
3 comment. Would anybody else like to supplement their
4 previous comments?

5 We are scheduled to stay in session for some time
6 to be available for either folks here who decide they
7 would like to say something further or if someone arrives
8 later this evening and wants to add comments.

9 So we will recess at this point; but if either
10 you or some new arrival decides to add comments, we'll
11 reconvene and be available to transcribe their comments.

12 And, again, I appreciate your attendance. I'd
13 like to remind you that the comment period remains open
14 until June 27. So comments in any form can be submitted
15 until that time, and those will count equally -- whatever
16 form they're submitted in, they all count equally in DOE's
17 determination for the Final EIS.

18 So, again, thanks very much, and we will be
19 recessed.

20 (Recess)

21 MR. BROWN: I'm going to reconvene this hearing
22 and ask if there are any other members of the public who
23 would like to make a statement at this time.

24 And noting that no one has indicated an interest
25 in making a statement, this concludes this session of the

1 hearing on the Draft EIS for Greater-Than-Class C
2 Radioactive Waste, and I thank you for your participation.

3 We are officially adjourned.

4 (Hearing adjourned at 8:37 p.m.)

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

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

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I, Jeri L. Chandler, Certified Shorthand Reporter, in and for the State of Washington, do hereby certify:

That the foregoing proceedings were reported by me stenographically and later transcribed into typewriting under my direction; that the foregoing is a true record of the proceedings taken at that time.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF I have set my hand this ____ day of _____, 2011.

JERI L. CHANDLER, RPR, RMR
CCR NO. 3191